DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 554 HE 010 552

AUTHOR Smith, Wendell I.
TITLE Enhancing Teaching in a Residential College. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Bucknell Univ., Lewisburg, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 77
GRANT OEG-0-75-2202
NOTE 100p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Curriculum Development; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Governance; Higher Education; Improvement Programs; Information Dissemination; *Instructional Improvement; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Bucknell University PA

ABSTRACT

A project at Bucknell University is described that was designed to: evaluate faculty teaching, conduct faculty seminars and workshops, disseminate sources of information to faculty, provide funds for the support of instructional improvement projects, develop a means of relating the quality of teaching and scholarship to a system of financial and nonfinancial incentives, and improve the sabbatical leave and related programs. The project is discussed under three general headings: changes having to do with the faculty and its teaching directly; changes having to do with new curricular projects; and changes having to do with institutional governance and the faculty. To implement the faculty's policies regarding teaching, each department prepared a statement of criteria for teaching, scholarship, and related professional services for judging tenured and non-tenured faculty and for conducting annual reviews of faculty members. Five projects are summarized that promoted professional development and course development. Program activities are evaluated, and the following materials are appended: faculty activities report, perceptions of a merit salary system, example of a departmental profile and of a faculty profile, memorandum on faculty development, and a sample of a freshman survey. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED010552

ENHANCING TEACHING IN A RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE

Wendell I. Smith, Provost
Bucknell University

What greater or better gift
can we offer the republic than
to teach and instruct our youth.

Cicero

FINAL REPORT

to

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

NATIONAL PROJECT III
Elevating the Importance of Teaching

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Lewisburg, Pennsylvania
September, 1977

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

page

Place of Teaching at Bucknell University 1

The Goals of NP III and Bucknell University. 2
The Intentions 3
The Activities 4

Evaluation 4

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Introduction 6

Analysis of Departmental Criteria
The Faculty and Teaching 7
The Faculty and Scholarship 7
The Faculty and Service 8

Evaluation of Faculty
The Merit System 10
Sources of Information 12
Departmental Profiles 12
Individual Profiles 13

Professional Development
Consultants and Workshops 14
Development Grants 15
Sabbatical leaves
Special leaves
Special funds
The Curricular Dimension
Faculty Seminars and Colloquia 17
Freshman Humanities Semester 18
Distinguished Visiting Mathematicians . . . 19
Committee on the Social Sciences 19
Principles of Economics 19

RESULTS

Schema for Evaluation 21

CONTENTS (cont'd)

page

Goals Statements and Development Grants 21

Improvements in Teaching: Use of Information
Workshops 21
Newsletter 29
Department Heads 30

The Curricular Dimension Evaluated
Faculty Seminars 32
Freshman Humanities Semester 34
Other Projects 38

Academic Advising 40

The Recognition of Teaching 42
Organizational Effectiveness 43
The Critical Incidents 44
Teaching Awards. 47
Satisfaction with Faculty and with Majors 47
Alumni: Nominations of Faculty 50
An Independent Student Evaluation 53

Some Issues of Faculty Governance 56

Recommendations Regarding Teaching 56

APPENDICES

A. Faculty Activities Report. 58

B. Perceptions of a Merit Salary System 60

C. Example of a Departmental Profile and of a Faculty Profile 68

D. Memorandum on Faculty Development 75

E. The Freshman Survey 78

Place of Teaching at Bucknell University

Residential, private colleges have a history in the United States that spans the existence of the country. The major contributions of these colleges well into the Nineteenth Century were to instruction of their students. Bucknell University was founded in that tradition, too, in 1846, thus, its history is replete with expressions of its support of creative teaching.

> The things taught in schools and colleges are not an education, but the means of education.
>
> Emerson

The Bucknell University Faculty Handbook, a work that was prepared by faculty members, notes that

> Teaching is the principal activity in which the faculty and the University are engaged. All of the other activities of the professional staff of the University are means to achieve that end. Typically, learning extends beyond the classroom and includes other students and teachers. There is, of course, no formula which will generate excellence in teaching, but such is a demand for it and such is its power that its presence is felt throughout the University community.

Given Bucknell University's traditions and nature, its assumptions, goals, and emphases, its recognition of itself as a set of learning communities, and its emphasis on the primacy of teaching, of which the scholarship of the faculty is considered an essential part,[1] its inclusion in National Project III is a cause for satisfaction since teaching has been, is, and will continue to be the University's first priority for all of its members for "Men learn while they teach." (Seneca)

[1]The Faculty Handbook reaffirms this point in its statement that scholarship "is a demonstration of the teacher's ability to work as a student of a subject, advancing it through originality in vision and offering the results to one's peers for their judgment and enlightenment."

The broad goals of National Project III, Elevating the Importance of Teaching (NP III), were given as:

> "1. Refine evaluation, expand diagnostic capabilities, and increase the use of measures of teaching effectiveness in reaching decisions on merit.
>
> "2. Examine relationships between effective teaching and existing incentive/support activities.
>
> "3. Study the relationships between selected components of effective teaching.
>
> "4. Develop means of disseminating information regarding effective teaching and its evaluation.
>
> "5. Expand support for faculty development."

How could Bucknell University contribute to the achievement of some of these goals? Bucknell is private, residential, very selective, of modest size,[2] committed to liberal studies and professionally oriented studies, and it emphasizes the centrality of teaching. An institutional self-study was completed in 1972-73, the Faculty Handbook was revised by the faculty in 1973-74 to specify the rights and responsibilities of the faculty more clearly, and several curricular projects were being developed when Bucknell became a Fund Associate of NP III in 1975.

Professional growth and self-development is included in the Faculty Handbook as one of the rights of the faculty. The policy states:

> Professional growth and self-development are personal matters which originate within the individual faculty member. . . . Paramount to professional growth is the willingness to experiment. Bucknell supports such experimentation . . . a second condition for professional growth and development. . . involves positive counseling and evaluation.

One of the important policies that was adopted by the faculty concerns the counseling of faculty members. The policy notes, in part:

---

[2] 3100 students, 206 faculty

> The conditions for high productivity may be broadly defined by those processes and standards related to selection, development, evaluation, promotion, and reward systems, each of which has as its primary objective the enhancement of the effectiveness of each member of the staff. . . . Each department is to determine its goals and (these) . . . are to be used when evaluating members of the department. Members . . . will be informed of these goals and help will be given in determining the extent to which each faculty member's plans for professional development are congruent with the goals of the department. . .

The Faculty Handbook contains several additional elements related to professional self-development: review of teaching, scholarship, and service by colleagues, students and administrators; maintenance of competence following the conferral of tenure as well as before; merit pay; nonfinancial incentives; and several formal reviews of performance by a departmental committee on retention before tenure is recommended. Some of these intentions were in the process of being met in 1975; some are still to be met.

The Intentions

Bucknell's intentions for NP III were derived from formal faculty policies, and our traditions in teaching; these intentions may be summarized as:

1. Build and maintain a faculty which is characterized by high quality, flexibility for meeting a changing curriculum, and efficiency in the use of talents.

2. Emphasize excellence in teaching rather than tenure quotas as a means for enhancing the quality of the faculty.

3. Create conditions that will facilitate and support the faculty's concern for its quality and effectiveness.

4. Increase the focus of both students and faculty members on the positive relationship between teaching and scholarship.

5. Foster the expectation that each department and each faculty member are to work toward well-defined goals for teaching and scholarship.

The Activities

The activities that were correlated with the intentions were:

1. Evaluate the teaching of all members of the faculty periodically, the evaluations to be based on the plans developed by the faculty members and reviewed with their departmental chairperson and college dean.

2. Conduct workshops for faculty members on goal setting, methods of teaching, methods of counseling for professional development, and techniques for evaluating teaching.

3. Provide the faculty with sources of information on teaching and evaluating teaching.

4. Provide funds for the support of projects on teaching, and improving courses.

5. Conduct faculty seminars and colloquia on curricular matters and teaching, the seminars and colloquia to be done by faculty and consultants.

6. Develop a means of relating the quality of teaching and scholarship to a system of financial and non-financial incentives.

7. Improve the sabbatical leave and related programs of leaves to provide opportunities for faculty members to engage in reorientation within a discipline and training in a related discipline.

Evaluation

> You cannot teach a man anything, you can only help him to find it within himself. Galileo

The primary focus of NP III was to be placed on evaluations of current practices. Where does one look on one's campus for evidence that good teaching is taken seriously by students, by faculty, and by administrators? If one finds that good teaching

is taken seriously on a campus, how does one determine that it is effective? We may, with Mark Twain, agree that, "Training is everything," and even that "cauliflower is nothing but cabbage with a college education," but how can we discover the effects of the faculty's 'teaching' in the transformation of those cabbages into cauliflower? The Fund Associates of NP III entered their two-year association with a range of questions and propositions. Some projects were concerned with the relatively specific, e.g., the evaluation of a method for assessing teaching or assessing the effectiveness of a program of teaching awards. Others were concerned with broader, more amorphous programs, e.g., evaluation of a collective bargaining agreement in which an incentive and reward system are linked to instructional improvement. The intentions and activities of Bucknell's project led it to be concerned with the evaluation of some programs among many.

It would be no more than commonplace, but necessary, to observe that colleges and universities are organizations in which the members have complex and varying roles in programs and activities. Students become teachers and teachers become students. Administrators may become teachers of faculty and students at some times, and they, too, may be students at others. And, of course, both students and teachers can be found, upon occasion, serving in administrative roles. Causes may become effects while some effects go on to become causes in a tumbling, bewildering cascade of interlocked activities. How can one evaluate the importance of teaching under these conditions, particularly the teaching that is done by the members of the organization? The classic experimental designs in which one or more factors are varied while others are held constant are not very useful. A case study in which the institutional milieu for learning and teaching is described along with observations, both qualitative and quantitative, of the effects of a particular program or activity is not applicable either. Even a small institution of higher education, one with a thousand students is too complex to accomplish this end, particularly if the academic degree programs are characterized by few distribution requirements. Under these circumstances one can select a few programs and activities for evaluation, then, describe them and some of their outcomes with enough precision that others who wish to could replicate them. The option assumes that this sampling of programs, activities, and measures of outcomes is representative of the whole and can fairly be said to characterize the whole. This report of Bucknell's activities is a report of sample programs and activities and the efforts to evaluate their effects on teaching and its recognition.[1]

---

[1]The curricular programs and seminars were not supported by the grant from NP III; the workshops and the evaluation were.

In work of this character, there is no clear beginning or ending; the organization goes on with a life of its own. We can hope, at best, to bring "illumination" to a few of its facets.[1]

Programs and Activities

Bucknell's intentions under NP III now will be described more fully under three general headings: (a) changes having to do with the Faculty and its teaching directly; (b) changes having to do with new curricular projects and their effects on the improvement of teaching; and (c) changes having to do with institutional governance and the faculty.[2]

Why was our focus spread over several programs and activities? Is there not a risk of too much diffusion and too little vision? Of too much obfucation and too little "illumination"? It is assumed here that teaching is more than those events that occur in the classroom and laboratory. If one looks at all carefully on our campuses at where learning occurs, who is the teacher in each case, and what the mode of teaching is, a focus on classroom activity alone will result in too narrow a view of teaching particularly in small residential institutions. Advising and counseling; preparing syllabi and reading lists; visiting places where students congregate; accompanying students on tours and field trips, involving students in one's research; assigning and grading papers; conferences with students; attending, initiating, supporting, and participating in extracurricular activities; and, work with students in governing an institution--these are some of the important means by which students and faculty members learn from each other in institutions like Bucknell. The assessment and evaluation of teaching, as well as of efforts to improve teaching and increase its importance, may well be more useful when one examines a variety of outcomes and sources, both direct and indirect.

---

[1] Evaluation in education in which the social context and its interaction with the changes introduced in it are recognized as affecting the outcomes is said to represent the social anthropology paradigm. See, Malcolm Parlett and David Hamilton Evaluation as Illumination: A new Approach to the Study of Innovatory Programs. October, 1972.

[2] In a sense, many of the activities described in this report will be seen to be elements of a large-scale program of professional development.

The Faculty and Teaching

To implement the Faculty's policies (Faculty Handbook) regarding teaching, each department prepared a statement of criteria for teaching, scholarship, and related professional services. These statements serve as goals against which the contributions of non-tenured faculty members are judged. The statements are used, also, by some departments in the evaluation of tenured faculty members. Lastly, they are used less formally in the annual review of faculty members for recommendations on merit salary increments, promotion, and professional development.

A content analysis of the current evaluation statements was made in 1977 to ascertain how teaching, scholarship, and service were defined by the instructional departments, in practice, what relative weights were assigned to the three areas, and the limits set for them. The analysis was done for each division and department.

The relative weights assigned to teaching and scholarship did not differ significantly among the divisions. Each division was explicit in their view that teaching is the principal activity of faculty members, with scholarship an important, necessary adjunct for most of the departments.

The criteria for teaching in the humanities focus more on the personal qualities of the teacher than on process, e.g., approachability and helpfulness, self-reliance and independence, competency, versatility, acceptance of criticism, and cooperation. This is in decided contrast to both the natural sciences and the College of Engineering where personal qualities are rarely mentioned.

The departments in the College of Engineering, along with those for business and education, list the greatest number of criteria, and, in a sense, may be considered the most thorough and explicit.

Scholarship

Of the 23 departmental statements analyzed, five did not comment on the nature of the scholarship expected of faculty members, fourteen viewed it as an essential part of teaching, and the remainder considered it of secondary importance to teaching. The quality of scholarship was noted as important by all departments; quantity was demanded by only two.

The criteria of "good scholarship" are most complete for the sciences and engineering; they include any activity that increases competence or contributes to knowledge, e.g., publication

presentation of research results at professional meetings, receipt of research grants, referring articles and books, and engaging in research with students. The humanities departments do not comment directly on the nature of scholarship although they, too, tend to see it as essential and inseparable from effective teaching. The range of activities considered acceptable as evidence of scholarship is broader than is the case for the social sciences and engineering, a finding that is to be expected from a group of disciplines which includes the fine arts, the performing arts, languages, literatures, classics, philosophy, and religion, among others.

Service

Service to the academic and professional communities has an entirely murky, ambiguous, continually shifting status on the American campus. There appears to be general agreement on these points: (a) service by faculty members to the profession and to one's college or university is necessary; (b) service is of less value than teaching and scholarship--of much less value, in fact, in decisions regarding tenure and promotion; and (c) the people who render much service to the governance of an academic community are thought to be trying to succeed by political means rather than on the merit of their contributions as teachers and scholars. There is a certain "Alice in Wonderland" quality in the traditional faculty view of its own governance, in that it wishes to have a voice in planning it, but it fears that it may be "Oysters dear" in the end.[1]

The criteria for service in the Bucknell statements fall into several categories that are not ranked in order of relative importance. The categories are:

Departmental

(a) committees
(b) administer special programs
(c) manage laboratories or other facilities
(d) library representative
(e) preparing proposals for funds for programs and equipment

---

[1] "A loaf of bread," the Walrus said,
"Is what we chiefly need;
Pepper and vinegar besides
Are very good indeed --
Now if you're ready, Oysters, dear,
We can begin to feed."
-- Lewis Carroll

(f) maintain equipment and collections
(g) job placement
(h) advising student groups, honoraries, etc.
(i) counseling and assisting colleagues
(j) recruiting staff
(k) program development

College and University
(a) formal governance bodies and committees
(b) participate in special programs
university relations with external constituencies
admissions
convocation
career planning
(c) curriculum development
(d) administer special programs part-time
(e) plan and develop interdisciplinary activities
(f) stimulation of intellectual life of campus
(g) advising on student government and other student activities
(h) sponsoring lectures

Professional
(a) service on regional, state, or national committees of one's professional organization
(b) holding office in a professional organization
(c) advising local, state, or national government or other bodies than one's professional associations
(d) administering a program of a professional association part-time

A collegial model of governance presumably recognizes that these acts of good citizenship by members of an academic community are vital to the continuation of the collegium. The ambivalance of faculty members toward participation in the management of their profession may be related to the ambivalence of the academy in the weight which it assigns to these qualities in the reward structure. There seemingly is little question regarding the importance and weight attached to departmental service; in large part, the activities can be seen as directly supportive of instruction and research. College and university governance, then, receives "no credit" or only casual reference in departmental statements of the expected performance of faculty members. It is not difficult to determine why senates, councils, and other college and university bodies for governance are in trouble. The "action" for faculty members across the nation nearly always is in their

discipline and department. Departments establish the standards, write the criteria, conduct the staff reviews, and prepare the recommendations for appointments, retention, tenure, and promotion. A department's priorities are not likely to extend much beyond its boundaries.

Review of Faculty

All reviews for retention and promotion, as well as an annual review of all faculty members for setting salary increments, are based on the departmental statements of goals and criteria. It is essential that the full faculty be involved in the utilization of the criteria statements for teaching, scholarship, and service if teaching is, in fact, to be perceived as the most important activity in which the members of the guild engage. Who must value excellence in teaching, engage in efforts to improve teaching, insist on recognition for good teaching? The faculty as a corporate whole. The corporate faculty sets and enforces the standards, in practice; thus, it must be provided with the time, encouragement, resources, and opportunity to exercise its inherent right to develop and operate a system that is supportive of those standards.

In Bucknell's program, the faculty has provided for departmental review committees that are responsible for informing those reviewed of the outcomes of the assessment. This leads almost at once to a partnership in which the person under review contributes to the file, interprets the file, and responds to constructive criticism of his or her performance, before any report is made to an administrator. To ensure that reviews are carried out with care for due process, a standing faculty committee reviews all cases of non-retention and serves as a grievance committee on any personnel matter, again, without intervention of any administrator.

One of the areas that has received considerable attention at Bucknell under NP III has been the improvement of the annual review of faculty members and the communication of the outcomes of the reviews to them, particularly the basis for and the nature of the merit increments. An annual salary review which includes comments and data on teaching, scholarship, and service, is done for each faculty member by the department head and the academic dean. The reviews result in a performance rating, usually on a scale of I (excellent) to IV (questionable), and merit salary increments are equated to the ratings.[1]

---

[1]A few department heads will not assign ratings but they will provide information and qualitative judgments.

The merit system was discussed with a faculty committee concerned with economic benefits during the Winter months of 1975-76 and, again, of 1976-77. The discussion centered on the perception of the system by members of the faculty, particularly of its relationship to the quality of one's teaching and of one's scholarship. Recommendations of principles for allocating salary increments for 1976-77 were implemented. A survey (See Appendix B) of the the faculty's perceptions of the system was conducted in the Spring of 1976, a month after the annual letter of reappointment and salary for 1976-77 had been mailed to each faculty member. The results of the survey, then, were used as one of the bases for the discussion of merit salary increments for 1977-78.

A salary increment for 1977-78 could consist of three components: (a) an across-the-board payment, e.g., four percent of salary for 1976-77; (b) an equity payment to correct for one or another systemic inequity; and (c) a merit payment that varied with rank. Department heads were given these data and they were asked to provide the college deans with the reactions of faculty members to the modifications in the system. As a consequence of the changes in the administration of salaries, the faculty's perceptions of the relationship between their achievements in teaching and scholarship and the annual salary increment are decidedly more positive. Whether or not one is satisfied with an increment aside, the basis for it has become clearer.

The development of departmental statements of criteria and the progress in relating achievement to salary (and, parenthetically, to retention, tenure, promotion, and sabbatical leaves) lead to greater interest on the part of the faculty in the types of evidence used in assessing achievements in teaching, as well as in scholarship and to a concern for the reliability and validity of the various types of evidence. Too, under these conditions, the need grows for more systematic counseling and assistance from peers with career development and progress, both in improving teaching and scholarship. What are the options that are most promising for these purposes for a residential, undergraduate faculty of modest size?[1]

---

[1]See CRITERIA II, "Student Evaluation of Teaching" for a discussion of issues and for examples of two systems developed by Fund Associates, viz., CAFETERIA that was developed at Purdue University and IDEA that was developed at Kansas State University; see CRITERIA VI, "Evaluation of College Teachers" for a discussion of evaluation for purposes of retention, promotion, and salary. (CRITERIA is published by the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan.)

Multiple sources of information and evidence are needed to assess teaching as it is defined above. The type(s) of information that may be useful for making administrative decisions on retention, tenure, and promotion may be different than the types of information needed for diagnosing the improvements needed in teaching and in scholarship. Further, the types of information used may vary with the institution, the discipline, the goals of the faculty member, the stage of the person's career, the types and levels of courses taught, and so on. Each faculty member at Bucknell is invited to submit to the College Dean and the Provost an annual report of scholarship, teaching, and professional services; approximately 90 percent do so each year. (See Appendix A)

The data in the annual reports are considered in the annual review. Other data, such as self-analyses and goals statements, student evaluations of teaching, colleague evaluations of teaching and scholarship and interviews with students, are used, also. Not all of these types of data are expected to be available for each person each year. Non-tenured faculty members are expected to provide evidence periodically concerning the quality of their teaching; however, no single evaluation form, or in an extreme instance, no evaluation form at all, is required.

Through workshops, newsletters, and the distribution of appropriate articles during the past three years, the range and the quality of the means of assessing teaching by students seem to have improved but the original goal of "developing more effective indices of effective teaching" has not been met insofar as the use of a common assessment form is concerned. Our experience suggests that it would be unwise for us to press for the use of a common set of items for all faculty in all courses, however, a <u>core</u> of items common to all faculty members would be desirable.

<u>Departmental Profiles</u>

To increase the likelihood that the broad context in which each faculty member works receives consideration, and to ensure that there is as much credibility as can reasonably be created in the decisions that are made regarding teaching, scholarship, and service, <u>departmental profiles</u> are being developed.

A persisting question relating to the assessment of the effectiveness of instruction, thus to prescriptions for its improvement in individual instances or for a department, is the question of what quality can properly be expected? One sometimes hears a wish for "uniform standards of evaluation, uniformly applied, across the institution," an ideal impossible

of attainment. Discipline, class size, level of course, type of course, personalities of students, personalities of instructors, departmental missions, students' goals for their education, workloads of students, workloads of faculty members are some of the variables that might affect judgments of quality in subtle ways. Each profile contains data on enrollments, by course and by level; number of faculty; composition of faculty by rank, age, sex, experience, interests, special talents; number of advisees for each faculty member; number of majors; graduate program, if one exists, and its size and its role in the department; service functions in the University and outside the University; special programs such as honors, off-campus study, freshman advisor seminars, and interdisciplinary instruction; and special problems, qualities, and obligations such as animal facilities to be maintained, human research subjects to be protected, special constituencies to be satisfied, and so on.

Given a particular combination of variables and qualities that can be said to characterize a department, what should we expect of the department in teaching, scholarship, and research? This clinical or situational appraisal of the conditions under which instruction occurs leads one to focus heavily on organizational climate and organizational change, areas which are notably recalcitrant to traditional modes of evaluation. The profiles may be viewed, then, as descriptions of one set of situational or organizational components in learning. Faculty development and program development, to be considered in succeeding sections of this report, can be more responsive to needs because of these data bases or profiles. The evaluation of teaching and of curricular programs serves to bring about a continual interplay of these components.

Beginning with the Summer, 1976, individual profiles[1] were developed for faculty members. In time, it may be possible to match the talents of faculty members with college and departmental needs with greater accuracy.

Professional Development

Professional or faculty development is an active, central component of the life of a faculty; an overview of the activities at Bucknell was given to the Bucknell faculty in October, 1976. (See Appendix D)

---

[1] A sample of a fictitious departmental profile and a fictitious individual profile is given in Appendix C.

Consultants and Workshops

To develop greater skills in professional development in house, the college deans and five members of the faculty participated in a five-day faculty development workshop sponsored by the consortium of Colleges of the Finger Lakes (CCFL) in the Summer, 1975. The college deans participated in a two-day seminar on management by objectives and in a workshop on teaching held in Corning, New York in 1975. A conference for faculty, students, administrators and trustees on teaching and education was held on the campus in September, 1975.

Weekend workshops on teaching were conducted for 20-30 faculty members on two occasions in 1975-76 by a consultant on goal setting (Jack Lindquist, University of Michigan), and one on the evaluation of teaching (Bonnie Larson, CCFL). Further consultation on teaching was done in a workshop in the Fall, 1976, in which the consultants were Stephen Scholl (Ohio Wesleyan) and Gerald Bakker (Earlham College). The particular themes were learning and teaching styles, some teaching techniques, course development, and instruction and personal development. Evaluative comments on these workshops will be given later.

A two-day workshop on faculty development for department heads was conducted in the Fall, 1975 by John Shtogren.[1] The primary purpose of these discussions was to encourage department heads to consider the need for and nature of faculty development at Bucknell. A brief position paper for use in planning was the product. (See pages 30 and 31)

Four faculty members participated in a national conference on faculty development in 1976-77 and others attended meetings of other groups around the country and shared their experiences with several other faculty members.

William Toombs of the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the Pennsylvania State University prepared and discussed with a faculty committee a position paper on departmental planning and staffing in 1977.

In the Spring, 1977, Warren Seibert gave two days to a discussion of the evaluation of teaching, with particular reference to Purdue's CAFETERIA system for approximately two dozen faculty members.

Lastly, several of the faculty members who had participated

[1]Associate Project Director, "Facilitating Faculty Development Through Department Chairpersons," Virginia Commonwealth University.

in earlier workshops, both on and off-campus, met informally several times each year for discussion of particular concerns for teaching. Some of the outcomes of the workshops, and the use of consultants will be presented in the section on results.

Development Grants

The programs and activities that have been described thus far in this report lead rather directly into principles, policies, plans, and practices for the professional development of individuals in contrast to the abstractions, "the faculty," or "faculty members." Published criteria for publicly recognized standards of teaching, departmental reviews and feedback to each faculty member, workshops and newsletters on more or less general themes of teaching, bring to the fore specific problems and concerns of individual faculty members to be solved, presumably through a combination of individual efforts and institutional support structures.[1]

The Provost's "Memorandum on Faculty Development," (Appendix D) notes that instructional budgets tend to include modest amounts for services and materials, for travel to meetings, for the rental of films, and the like. Special funds must be obtained in nearly all colleges for non-routine items. Since Bucknell received several grants for professional development during 1972-1975, it was possible to implement some of the plans that were developed by deans, departments, and individual faculty members for carrying out major changes in a course, program, curriculum, support structure for teaching, or person's skills. Some examples follow, the results of them, to the degree that they yet are discernible, will be treated later in the report.

---

[1]Several of the projects of the Fund Associates of NP III are directly related to these issues. See, for example, CRITERIA I, in which summaries of projects are given.

Thoughtful treatments of the challenges and issues to be met in creating appropriate support structures for professional development and managing them will be found in CRITERIA III: "Institutional Support for Teachers" and in CRITERIA IV, "Professional Development of Faculty."

The sabbatical leave program was expanded in 1975 from nine to fourteen each year and approximately five additional, special leaves have been granted in each of the past two years.

> The main purpose of the leave policy is to improve the professional competence of the faculty and thereby the instructional program of the University.
>
> Faculty Handbook

A proposal for automatic sabbatical leaves by the faculty committee which administers the leave program now is under review for the cost of implementation. Under the plan, faculty members still would be required to prepare a formal proposal for a leave and receive approval from the department head, dean, and committee. This is an extension of the current practice of requesting each applicant to explain how the project will advance his or her professional development. The committee would work with any faculty member whose proposal was not supportive of professional progress. Since projects may be related to teaching, as well as to scholarship, an automatic leave program could be a useful adjunct in support of professional development.

Special leaves grow out of both departmental and disciplinary needs as well as the needs of faculty members. Six special leaves were granted in 1975-76, four in 1976-77, and four in 1977-78. Nine of the leaves were directly related to instruction rather than scholarship. Four of the leaves were given to engineering faculty who wished to relearn and improve skills or to learn a new area of their discipline. The other leaves were given for projects related closely to teaching new courses, preparing text materials for new courses, revamping of laboratory work for a course or sequence of courses, and retraining for a radical shift within one of the disciplines.

In nearly every one of these instances, the source of or the first contact with the "case" was the annual review of faculty. One of the important by-products of the efforts to clarify the basis for decisions on merit salary increments is more frequent and deeper conversations within departments regarding departmental goals and needs and individuals' goals and needs. The opportunities for counseling and advising faculty members on career planning, professional growth, improvement in teaching, and improvement in scholarship have increased significantly, because the deans and some of the department heads have become both more sensitive to and more skilled in assisting faculty members in formulating questions on career planning and developing solutions to them.

Development funds have been allocated as incentives to spend part or all of a summer on teaching or scholarship, as matching or supplemental funds for participation in sponsored short courses, seminars, and international meetings. Released time for projects, subsidies for publications, subsidies for the Bucknell University Press, subsidies for scholarship, and funds for the preparation of proposals for external funding are other examples of professional development activities related to individual development. (See Table II, p. 23 for a statistical summary.)

The Curricular Dimension of Faculty Development

> . . . improved teaching means that the instructional process is less ambivalent, more pointed, more efficient. . . the teaching process flows more directly out of its purposes. . . (L. Richard Meeth)[1]

A faculty's interest in discussions of teaching nearly always is enhanced when the what is to be taught to whom is included with the how and under what conditions. Several of the projects and activities at Bucknell for the life of NP III focused on departments and faculty members in the humanities and in the social sciences because they were engaged in a sustained discussion of the humanities and the social sciences, with particular emphasis on their place in the liberal studies. Inevitably, such discussions tend to broaden the circle to include in due course faculty from the sciences and engineering, since they, too, are concerned with the content of liberal education and for the effectiveness with which the teaching is done.

(1) Eight faculty seminars and eight University Colloquia on the humanities were conducted during 1975-76. Twenty-one faculty members participated formally in all of the seminars and colloquia. A participant-evaluator obtained a written evaluation of each seminar and each colloquium from each of the 21 persons and from eight additional "interested" faculty members. In addition, he interviewed each of the 21 at the conclusion of the year's program. The findings will be given in the section on results.

The Faculty Seminars were directed toward the belief that,

> for any genuine renovation of liberal education (to occur), faculty members must be brought into a situation where they can, in the best academic manner, encounter each

[1] "What is Improved Teaching?" Change, 9, 1, 1977

> other and consider together their respective orientations, interests, and frames of reference.

The University Colloquia, which were coordinated with the seminars, were based on the belief that,

> persons from outside the University (could) assist in the process of reflecting on the meaning and implications of . . . liberal education . . .

Dozens of other faculty members, along with administrators and students, participated in the University Colloquia.

(2) The Freshman Humanities Semester (FHS) serves as a second example of a systematic effort to include a professional or faculty development component in a significant curriculum project and to incorporate program evaluation and faculty evaluation in such projects from their inception.

Briefly, (FHS) consisted of three, newly designed, interrelated courses that were taken as a block by 39 students in the Fall, 1975. The courses were titled:

> "The Character and Contradictions of Modernity" -- first five weeks
> "Reason and Human Values" -- remaining nine weeks
> "Writing Tutorial" -- fourteen weeks

The courses were designed during a month-long workshop for the participating faculty in the Summer, 1975. Three formal evaluations of the project were undertaken at the end of the first year. First, a consultant was asked to review the courses, the procedures, the teaching, and the total project. He interviewed administrators, faculty, and students and he visited classes, seminars, and lectures during his two-day visit in the first month and his two-day visit in the last month of the semester. Second, a staff evaluator, an educational psychologist, worked with the participating faculty from the beginning of the project in the development and implementation of an evaluation plan for the program and for teaching. Third, several questions regarding FHS were incorporated into a larger study, an evaluation of the freshman year at Bucknell by freshmen. (See Appendix E) FHS was repeated in the Fall, 1976, following a second summer workshop, and evaluations of it were done in the Spring and Summer, 1977. The program is to be done again in the Fall of 1977 following another month-long workshop for revisions and training of new faculty. A handbook for use by new faculty for FHS courses was prepared in the Summer, 1977.

Nine faculty members served as the core staff for the project. FHS involved several elements that were novel for the faculty participants. These were (a) use of discrete modules, (b) integration of writing and composition with other courses, (c) team teaching, (d) division of semester into variable units of time, (e) presentation of an original lecture each week by a faculty member, and (f) construction of formal critiques of each lecture by students. Students were asked, too, to comment on and prepare a critique of anything regarding the program, including the faculty. The results of this project will be considered later in the report.

(3) A program of Distinguished Visiting Mathematicians was initiated in 1973 and continues into 1977-78. The intent of the program is to build and maintain a core faculty of very high quality in an undergraduate, residential college located at some distance from an urban center. Six to eight mathematicians are invited each year to spend a week on campus to work in their specialty with one or more members of the Department of Mathematics. The visits include one or more general seminars on the current state of knowledge of a topic, e.g., operator theory or Lie algebra. Each visitor also is expected to assist one or more of the Bucknell faculty in initiating research or in moving a research project along to the point of publication.

(4) An ad hoc Committee on the Social Sciences was brought into being in 1975-76 to review the needs of the faculty in these disciplines. During 1976-77, several colloquia on the "state of the discipline" were conducted by social science faculty for the faculty at large. Statistics projects and computing activities initiated by some social science faculty have added an additional component to the professional development of the group. A two-course sequence in social science was developed by four departments during the Summer of 1977 following a year of planning by one faculty member under a fellowship of the National Endowment for the Humanities at Yale University. This project, like those described for the humanities, tries to confront the questions of what is to be taught, to whom, by whom, in what manner, and evaluated in what fashion. What happens to faculty and to students as a result of the changes in curriculum and to what extent it happens are questions that give more meaning to student evaluation forms, instructional improvement centers, teaching effectiveness workshops, and some of the other components of a faculty's professional development.

(5) The last example of linking a faculty development component to curriculum development involves one department and a course on the principles of economics. The course enrolls approximately 500 students in the Fall term, an extraordinary enrollment problem for a department of only six full-time faculty members. An

enrollment of this relative size can be taken as a challenge to develop materials, teaching methods, and a format suitable for large group instruction. The challenge was accepted and the summer of 1975 was given over to the development of materials by several members of the Department. The work was supported, in part, by foundation funds for faculty and program development. Materials were tried out in the Fall, 1975, revised and expanded during the Summer, 1976 and 1977. The "materials" have now become a textbook that is under contract with a publisher.

Summer support is essential for course development of this type. Five persons participate in teaching the course in economics as a team and the twin objectives of faculty and curriculum development can only be met by an extended period of time during which the individual talents and efforts of the faculty can be applied to the creation of a unified project. The subject matter is not conventional economic theory; thus, what is to be taught (and written), how and by whom cannot be planned and developed while teaching full-time. Evaluation of the course and the teaching was done by means of a comprehensive questionnaire each year and the results from this also serve to guide the summer's development work.[1]

On the curriculum side of faculty development, then, five projects in which both professional development and course development were twin objectives have been summarized. The effects of these on the improvement and recognition of teaching will be considered in the section on results, although only those portions of the evaluations that bear most directly on instruction can be considered in this report.

A concluding observation: One of the overriding values of supporting curriculum projects of the type described here, is to ensure that some courses, at least, are developed and taught for students -- not for "the profession" or for "the graduate schools." Our orientation to our discipline as a profession and to the graduate schools through which it is perpetuated causes us to be too much concerned for the one percent of students who eventually obtain a doctorate.

---

[1]The five faculty members gave a symposium on the course at the Eastern Economic Association in 1976 to obtain critiques from other economists.

RESULTS

Evaluation of the several programs and activities described above can be neither precise nor complete. The number of activities that were changed, the nature of the changes that were made, and the degree of the change presumably are interactive with each other and with a host of additional programs and activities that were not considered in this report. There was a significant change in leadership of the institution in 1976 with the appointment of a new president who entered quickly into the faculty's life through several means. The marked decline in the mobility of faculty and the rising advocacy relationship in which institutions find themselves vis a vis their students and their professional staff probably interacts, too, with the changing scene on a campus.

Since Bucknell's goals for NP III (See pages 3-4) were diverse and more general than specific, the results to be reported will be based in large part on indirect evidence regarding teaching. The goals, in summary form, were:

(a) develop goals statements (criteria) in each department of instruction, develop goals statements (plans) by individual faculty members, and support the development of some of these plans.
(b) foster improvements in and sensitivity to teaching and seek ways to make more effective use of information on teaching.
(c) develop a means of relating the quality of teaching and scholarship to a merit system more effectively.

A general schema for evaluation (see Table I) was devised in 1975; it provides an overview of several of the sources of data that are included in this report and the means for assessing the goals. The results of the work carried out under this project will be reported under the three general goals given above for the intentions and activities listed on pages 3 and 4.

Goals statements and implementation

The steps that have been taken in regard to departmental criteria statements were presented in some detail in the section on "The Faculty and Teaching" (page 7) and there is no need to comment on them further except to emphasize, once again, that these statements serve as guidelines for the plans and evaluation of individuals. The criteria statements of departments have been in existence now for three years; it is important to recognize the variability in their general substance, as was done

TABLE I - General Schema
Evaluation of Bucknell's Participation in National Project III

	Source of data	Means of assessment
1. "...bring together the several trends on campus into a greater consciousness on the part of students, administrators and faculty."	Faculty & student meetings, media, student newspapers, questionnaires & interviews.	Amount of time in deliberation, nature of decisions, data analysis.
2. (To assess) "...the relationship of these trends, projects, and activities to outstanding competence in teaching and learning on our residential campus, both in and outside the classroom."	Critical incidents of faculty teachings & student performance.	Correlations with critical incidents.
3. Foster the expectation...department...faculty...work toward well defined goals for T/S by providing (policy, administrative support)	Department criteria, faculty annual reports.	Content analysis; reviews by Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure
3.1 expertise (e.g., consultants)	Attendance, requests for help; information.	Counts
3.2 merit systems reliability tied to "work toward well-defined goals."	Merit awards, departmental ratings, faculty annual reports, alumni	Data analysis; sampling of faculty perceptions.
3.3 provide support for the improvement of courses and teaching	Financial data, including release time, merit raises.	Amounts
3.4 focus student, administrative and faculty support to quality of teaching in its broadest sense.	Faculty & student reports, alumni nominations	Same as the above.

Evaluation of Bucknell's Participation in National Project III (Cont'd)

		Source of data	Means of assessment
4.	Dissemination of information regarding Bucknell & FIPSE projects to other institutions.	Communications; consortium meetings; media.	No. of inquiries from & communications with other institutions.
5.	"Build and maintain a faculty ..."	Interview of applicants and annual reports of terminations.	What they know of Bucknell's programs.
6.	"...focus on the positive relationship between teaching and scholarship."	Annual reports; student and colleague reports.	Content Analysis of annual reports; student evaluations.

23

TABLE II
Distribution of Faculty Development Funds
by Category of Use and Curriculum
Division, 1974-1977 (4 years)[1]

	HUMANITIES # of Depts.	HUMANITIES # of Persons	SOC. SCI. # of Depts.	SOC. SCI. # of Persons	NAT. SCI. # of Depts.	NAT. SCI. # of Persons	ENGINEERING # of Depts.	ENGINEERING # of Persons	Other
Teaching Skills	6	6	4	6	2	2	1	1	5
Relearn Retrain	5	5	2	2	0	0	2	3	0
Improve or Develop Courses	9	22	5	17	3	7	2	3	5
Subsidy for Leaves	6	11	3	4	2	3	3	4	2
Scholarly Meetings	2	3	3	4	2	3	0	0	0
Research New	6	13	4	6	2	6	0	0	0
Research Continuation	5	13	1	2	3	6	1	1	0
Publications-Dissertations	6	20 / 93 (60)	2	2 / 43 (21)	3	2 / 29 (18)	1	1 / 13 (12)	3 / 15 (10)

[1]Funds are faculty development grants from sources external to Bucknell University.

earlier, and it is more important to note the variability in their applicability by department. All departments have and use criteria statements with non-tenured faculty, but relatively few apply them with equal force with tenured faculty. The proportion is increasing as merit salary increments and some other important incentives are perceived as related more directly to achievement. Individual plans and objectives that are derived from reviews of achievement against departmental criteria are more characteristic, then, of non-tenured than tenured faculty. This, too, already is changing as the non-tenured faculty call for similar reviews and plans for their senior colleagues. Other pressures act, too, on tenured faculty to lead them to more concern for their own evaluation. Some of these will be considered now very briefly.

Economic and budgetary consideration coupled with an oversupply of qualified candidates for almost any vacancy serves to remind the senior faculty of their responsibility to continue to strive for excellence. When they do not, students and junior colleagues give them signals. More direct effects are felt when plans are reviewed by faculty committees for curricular flexibility, staffing flexibility, and, to a lesser degree, financial flexibility in the face of "tenuring in."

At Bucknell, the faculty's responses to these budgetary/flexibility questions have been to include a requirement that all departments engage in long-range planning, that all vacancies be reviewed by a faculty committee on staff allocation, and that all line items that are to be added be reviewed by a faculty budget committee. The administration prepared a position paper, "Building the Finest Faculty. . ."[1] for discussion by the faculty and the governing board. The paper urged concern for very high quality in appointments to the faculty and in those retained. In response, the faculty created a Faculty Development Committee in the Spring, 1977, which has worked through the Summer of 1977 to develop policies for "the building." At this time, it seems likely that the recommendations will include a faculty committee on staff planning; a faculty committee on professional development; an all university tenure committee; and, a mandatory periodic review of the teaching and scholarship of the tenured faculty. Departmental profiles, individual faculty profiles, and related personnel procedures will be used by these committees.

As these activities have gone on--and it is worth observing that they are chiefly activities related to the faculty's governance of its own affairs--there has been considerable, low profile professional development, including some which was designed to implement plans to improve skills in teaching, relearn an area of a discipline, develop new courses or improve existing courses, improve the quality of research and the

[1]February, 1977

opportunities to engage in it, increase the opportunities for publication, provide assistance with leaves, and increase the opportunities for participation in professional meetings. In TABLE II, a summary is provided of the number of departments and the number of persons in each division who received funds over a four-year period and the category of use for the funds. For example, 20 different persons in the humanities who belong to 6 departments received subsidies for publication (chiefly for the publication of books by the Bucknell University Press). Or, 17 different persons in five social science departments received funds for course improvement, course development, or curriculum planning. Forty-two percent of the "total funds" was allocated to curriculum while only 1.2 percent was allocated to scholarly meetings. Teaching skills received 8.7, leaves 15, retraining 2.9, new research 11, continued research 10.5, and publications 8.9 percent. The total number of persons who received funds in each division is given and in the parentheses beside it will be found the total number of <u>different</u> persons who received funds in each division. The total number of different faculty members who received funds was 111 or approximately 50 percent of all faculty. The number of persons who received more than one grant can be determined by obtaining the difference between the sum of all persons for the division and the number of different persons in the division. For example, as many as 33 persons in the Humanities Division (93 minus 60) received more than one grant. Since 193 grants were allocated to 111 persons, there were as many as 82 persons who received more than one grant in the four-year period.

<u>Some cautions regarding the data in TABLE II</u>. First, these data do not represent all of the funds spent on these categories, nor do they represent all of the funds for these purposes from sources external to the instructional budget of the University. Second, and as a consequence, the total number of persons who received funds for professional development from all sources, is more than 111 and the total number of grants would certainly be more than 193. The data in TABLE II are those kept by the author for the purpose of accounting for a few large grants specifically designated for professional development and specifically under the direction of the Office of the Provost.

There are some definite biases in the sample given. First, engineering and the natural sciences are underrepresented in several categories, in that these divisions receive development funds and research funds from sources that are controlled by them. Second, the funds for new courses are more than 40 percent of the total; however, that proportion is considerably less if curriculum enrichment in two humanities departments is excluded. Third, the humanities division is the largest of the four and engineering the smallest, but frequencies are uncorrected for

this fact.

Of what use are the data in TABLE II, then? What do they tell us about the particular faculty that has been participating in the implementation of its Faculty Handbook? There have been some opportunities for relearning and retraining--10 persons have been involved and the number is a bit larger than that since some of the "Subsidy for Leave" funds were used quite directly for relearning and retraining. If curriculum enrichment is factored out, approximately $100,000 was used for 49 persons to develop new courses or improve old, while $83,000 was used by 47 persons for research. For purposes of faculty development, then, there was an allocation of funds that reflects the higher priority for teaching since more than two-thirds of the funds went to curriculum and teaching.

When there are funds available to support faculty projects, and when there are means for bringing departmental criteria more clearly and directly to faculty members, the level of activity of faculty in teaching and in some teaching-related activities increases significantly. What other data do we have that bear on this point? More Bucknell faculty members applied for National Endowment for the Humanities summer seminars for 1977 than ever and five were selected, more than ever before. A larger number of grant proposals that included an explicit concern for professional development, as well as for curriculum change, were prepared. Significantly more faculty members are applying for sabbatical leaves in which plans include a concern for pedagogy and its improvement in combination with learning something new in the discipline.

Improvements in teaching; more effective use of information

One of several ways of bringing the improvement of teaching to the attention of faculty members on a residential campus is to identify or develop a core of faculty members who are interested in and supportive of the concept. This was done, in part, through participation in off-campus workshops and symposia. These people, in turn, are encouraged to meet as a group on the campus and to include others in their discussions. In time, this active core is provided with an opportunity to sponsor workshops for other members of the faculty. A critical ingredient for the successful launching of workshops in smaller institutions, at least, is the inclusion of off-campus consultants on teaching. Several workshops of two days duration were held during 1974-77. Evaluation reports were obtained from the participants. What did these workshops accomplish from the perspective of the participants? A summary of the outcomes of one workshop held in February, 1976 may answer that question.

The evaluation requested of each of the 24 participants contained five questions.

(1) What did you hope to achieve from this workshop?

The group was about equally divided in their interest in acquiring specific techniques vs. general awareness and experience. Twelve participants hoped to develop new ideas which could be applied to their courses. Others wished to learn more about faculty development and/or common problems in teaching in general or to clarify goals and evaluation procedures for their own development. Five mentioned the opportunity to meet and exchange ideas on teaching with other faculty.

(2) What activities, materials, people helped you achieve the objective?

The number of participants who mentioned the following activities is:

consultant-client	3	role playing	8
seminars	2	simulation	4
advising	5	Keller plan	1
motivation session	1	action plans	2
video taping	4	learning styles	2

Three mentioned the spirit of collaboration and socialization among faculty. Two praised both consultants. A third appreciated one consultant's ability to grasp participants' viewpoints. Other comments included "concrete structure," "excellent organization," "variety of content and style," "doing rather than talking."

(3) What activities, materials, people hindered your achieving these objectives?

Six participants referred to the amount of time, the length of the day without breaks. Four referred to colleagues' "hang-ups," abstractness, and resistance to workshops. Six found some objection to the framework to participant-planned-activities, -- "lack of preplanned activities," "no theory of weekend," "lack of prior reading assignments." Three found some hindrance of one or both of the consultants, -- "smooth PR," "hesitancy to give their own views." Other comments included "too many charts," "hidden agenda," "mechanical presentations," "myself."

(4) Learning should not end at the conclusion of a class or workshop. What follow-up activities do you plan to pursue?

implement teachings in classroom	10
involve department in faculty development ideas	6
increase faculty sensitivity to student needs	3
self-evaluation	4
work through various arms of university governance	3

(5) What should we as a faculty do to follow up this workshop?

Six participants advocated future workshops, two specified workshops appropriate for new faculty. Four comments were in the area of fostering increased consciousness about faculty development. Five suggested a change in organization-- "create faculty development

committee," "involve the Faculty Seminar," "establish faculty leaders," "direct the administration toward teaching." Other comments included "evaluation of tenured faculty," "standardize student evaluation" and the acquisition and circulation of information regarding teaching effectiveness.

Another workshop was held in September, 1976, two weeks after the opening of a semester. Again, the weekend format with consultants from off-campus was used. Faculty members sponsored, planned, and managed this workshop as they did the one held in February. Preference was given to younger faculty and those who had not attended the first one. An important ingredient in the successful staging of these two workshops was the assignment of a member of the professional staff from the Provost's Office to handle all arrangements for the workshops, including publicity, enrollments, housing, food, travel for the consultants, etc. This had at least two important values: (a) It identified the chief academic officer with a program for the improvement of teaching and kept him informed of its progress and (b) it relieved faculty members of much of the responsibility for logistics.

The second workshop enrolled slightly more than 20 participants; thus, the two workshops for that year involved nearly 50 members or 25 percent of the faculty directly. The outcome of the second program was essentially the same as that presented above even though the program of activities differed significantly. Participants were invited to comment on The Future, on where to go next. Nearly everyone wished additional activities to continue, preferably on-campus, confined to a single topic, and presented in a reasonably short block of time, e.g., an evening or Saturday morning for two or three hours. The interests in things to be done ranged from discussions of growth contracts to demonstrations of microteaching, assistance in test construction, and information on the evaluation of teaching.

The workshops clearly met the primary objective of increasing the faculty's sensitivity to teaching, of elevating the importance of teaching--for awhile. There were lively discussions of the workshops by participants and non-participants alike.

The first of the workshops on teaching was sponsored in 1974 by three members of the faculty who also were Danforth Foundation Associates. The Danforth appointees for 1977 have proposed two workshops to increase the sensitivity of students and faculty to:[1]

---

[1]A proposal by Professor John Kirkland, Department of History

(1) There are a variety of teaching styles and some go better with particular teaching goals than others.
(2) Seemingly disparate disciplines of learning can be brought to focus on a common issue with no lessening of professional rigor and with mutual enlightenment.

The first conference, if held, will include five or six of the best exemplars of a spectrum of styles with a focus on the interrelationship of <u>what</u> and <u>how</u> one teaches. For example.

<u>How</u>	<u>What</u>
formal discursive argument	legal and moral decision making
informal collaborative discussion	collective social action
multi-perspectival readings of a text	multiple dimensions and meanings of a text
diacritical engagement in translations between "worlds" of meaning	history(s) of thinking(s)/ thinkings about history(s)

The intent is to move from workshops where there was a dependence on visiting consultants and prescriptive consideration of methods of teaching to workshops in which there is a focus on ". . . actual experiential action and subject matter, using Bucknell people. . ., and by the very form and sequence of the conference to structure a discussion process. . ." The view that is reflected in this faculty member's proposal is one that has evolved from the workshops, the faculty seminars, and the curriculum projects. It is a view to which we shall return shortly.

Discipline-oriented faculty members--and, are there any other kinds?--find workshops on the improvement of teaching to be unduly concerned with process and with exercises, with providing information on procedures and techniques, without due regard for the specific instances in which the teaching is to be done. Too many faculty members, therefore, complete the exercises with an attitude of, "This was fun, however. . ." The most important outcome of workshops and retreats tends to be those times that are unstructured and free for discussions among faculty members of their general concerns about teaching.

A newsletter on teaching was initiated by a faculty member in the same period as the workshops. Its contents were restricted to activities and views on campus. The newsletter served chiefly to report on some of the experiences of the workshops; thus, it served to reinforce the significance of them to at least some of the participants. The newsletter was not sustained beyond the period of the workshops and of the editorship of one faculty member.

A "Seminar on Teaching" was held on campus for a day in February 1977 specifically, a seminar on the use of students' comments as one source of information for the evaluation of teaching, conducted by Warren Seibert, Purdue University, an NP III Fund Associate. Thirty-one faculty members enrolled for all or the majority of the day-long session. An informal follow-up of the meeting revealed that some faculty members agreed to try Purdue's CAFETERIA system with the cooperation of Professor Seibert. Secondly, several of the participants have initiated a review of the instruments for student evaluation of teaching that are used in their departments.

Department heads carry a heavy responsibility for the faculty's professional development, particularly in an undergraduate institution or a small comprehensive university. One on-campus workshop was conducted by a consultant[1] for department heads only; approximately one-half of them participated. The chief product of the workshop was a set of observations, propositions, critical comments, and recommendations that are based directly on the comments of the participants. The statements were organized into five categories. The categories, each with three examples, are:

Faculty Development

(1) "The overall goal of a faculty development program at Bucknell should be to increase the faculty's self-esteem and sense of academic professionalism."

(2) "There are no individual department chairmen who could play a leadership role among their colleagues in faculty development. . . Initial leadership may have to come from above or outside."

(3) "Provisions have to be made in the merit pay system to reward <u>growth</u> as well as achievement. Right now the payoffs only come after you have made it within your field."

The Chair

(1) "Not all of us have a clear concept of our role as chairpersons. . .we should begin looking at all of our responsibilities, especially those related to faculty development . . ."

(2) "The chairperson's evaluator-counselor role may change the collegial relationship. . . Perhaps the most critical role in the process (faculty development) should be played by the administration rather than by the chairpersons."

(3) "How are we evaluated in our role as chairperson? Who will counsel us, assuming that we need to develop, too? The dean, provost, faculty?"

Goal-Setting and Counseling

(1) "We need to have a clear statement of what Bucknell is all about so that we can see our department and individual efforts in the total context."

---

[1]John Shtogren, Virginia Commonwealth University

(2) "There will not be much movement in the direction of this counseling process until the reward system clearly supports the departments' criteria."
(3) "The whole idea of goal-setting. . . may be more harmful than helpful. If faculty. . . never stretch their reach beyond stated objectives, it is a very limiting activity."

Bucknell - General Observations

(1) "We should be very wary of weakening the department as our primary unit. We would be ill-served to reorder the collegial relationship. . ."
(2) ". . . it is essential to maintain an open channel from the most junior faculty members to the most senior administrators."
(3) "We should take a close look at our overall system of communications. They may not need to be improved. . . Whether or not they (the faculty) are getting the information they deserve warrants a close examination."

What To Do Next

(1) "A series of regularly scheduled on-campus meetings could be called to help chairpersons clarify their roles."
(2) "Current chairpersons should develop a kind of orientation program for those who will be elected two years hence."
(3) "A workshop on goal-setting and performance--contracting would be useful."

The full set of statements includes a variety of positions on the chairperson and on professional development, an outcome to be expected in a strong, healthy institution. It is unreassuring for the future to find so much ambiguity regarding one's roles as a chairperson. If colleges and universities wish to count on the heads of departments to cooperate in the development and implementation of programs of curriculum and professional development, they will need to provide (a) training for them, (b) clearer definitions of their responsibilities, and (c) incentives that are related directly to their achievements as department chairpersons.[1]

The Curricular Dimension Evaluated

Teaching and the curricular dimension in a program for the professional development of faculty members received attention earlier in the report. (See page 17)

---

[1]It might be noted parenthetically that Bucknell's three Presidential Professors were departmental chairpersons at the time of their appointments. The special designation was intended to convey an appreciation of their significant roles in the University to them and to other members of the academic community.

Only those parts of the evaluation which bear most directly on teaching and instruction will be included in this report.[1] The curriculum projects provide an opportunity to consider teaching in the context of what is to be taught to whom and how, i.e., in what manner.

The evaluation of the Faculty Seminars (see page 17) was qualitative and phenomenological; the focus was more on what occurred rather than on how much occurred. The participant-evaluator, a formal role,[2] makes this point as follows:

> The descriptive task is not to find an average among these perspectives but to articulate the coordinates of these differences.

The Faculty Seminars, each of which paralleled a colloquium, come closer to concerns for teaching than do the colloquia, since each seminar was led by two faculty members. Some of the observations were:[3]

> I think very few people understand how I do research or how I teach. I also understand very little about how others teach. We have to get past the point where scientists just say they are "value-free" and others just say they are not. We need to see what we do.

> I suppose because of my involvement last year, I feel more willing to engage my colleagues in a discussion of what they do and how it relates. . . If we are all acknowledging that we need to do this, and you know you're not the only one, then serious discussion becomes more likely.

---

[1] Further information regarding the outcomes of these projects may be obtained from the author.

[2] Professor J. Ernest Keen, Department of Psychology.

[3] These quotations are drawn from Professor Keen's report, Evaluation of Faculty Seminars and University Colloquia, Bucknell University, 1975-76.

> When it comes to leading seminars. . . we are not very good at it, not very good at seducing people out into the discussion where discourse can take place. We can demonstrate our knowledge in our own language, but exchanging languages requires something else.
>
> There were some good moments this year, but the growth and transformation we hope for students did not occur (for us). We apparently do not hope for it for ourselves.
>
> What prevents. . . a vital program of (education) . . . is fear and ignorance self-imposed by faculty who prefer posturing to preparation, monologues to dialogue, security to risk, routine to vitality--a great many faculty used the failure of the Colloquium speakers to cover their own lack of contributions to the seminars.

The experience with the intensive set of seminars with their corresponding colloquia leads to these observations regarding their value as a means of increasing a concern for teaching:
(1) The context and setting in which serious conversations among faculty concerning the nature of education and its modes of presentation to students remain very important, yet little understood variables.
(2) Discussion of abstractions, of principles, and of points of view concerning education, teaching, and school learning by college faculty tends to remain on a superficial plane unless there is a task to be done, an end to be attained, an intention to progress.
(3) "Personal" commitment to the task, end, or purpose needs to be obtained very early in the process. Teaching each other about teaching and learning can be a painful experience, one in which a desire to change, grow, and improve serves to make the pain more tolerable.
(4) Monthly meetings, even when of three hours duration, are too infrequent to sustain a serious, continuing discussion of teaching.

And in regard to the common purpose of a faculty, Professor Keen writes of his year-long experience as a seminar member:

> We can and have agreed on statements of purpose. . . our unity must come to have

> other dimensions from what it already has. . . it most vividly lacks. . . an intellectual understanding, a shared understanding of the relationships among our disciplines. . . it is no wonder that our unifying "purposes" do not matter much to our daily teaching. The intellectual activities of teaching require intellectual contexts. In their absence . . . our teaching is bound to remain insular, contextless, unrelated to avowed common purposes. . .

The Freshman Humanities Semester (see page 18) was evaluated by several means. Given the low student-faculty ratio, the time for faculty to prepare new courses as a team, and the time to revise courses on the basis of student and peer evaluation, what do we learn about teaching under these conditions.

Evaluation by a Consultant[1]

Excerpts from the report provide one set of evaluative remarks.

> There is little doubt that FHS was an innovative, successful undertaking. . . This is not said as perfunctory preamble. It is relatively easy to tell whether a group of people share a common feeling of excitement and engagement. For the central core of faculty. . . there was the added factor of speaking to and learning from each other. . .
>
> The idea of students preparing a response or critique of faculty presentations is a delightful one. But it was clear to me that in the meetings I attended, most students were reticent about tangling with their "superiors".

Some valuable bits of serendipity:
(1) the benefits that come to faculty through joint teaching;
(2) a special closeness among students, encouraged first by the modules, and carrying over not only to the second part of the course but to their life outside the classroom. (A number of

[1]Professor Stanley Warner, an economist/faculty member, of Hampshire College visited the campus twice for two days each time during the conduct of the program.

students in the program said they ate together at lunch in order to continue discussions of the ideas raised in class.) (3) the early exposure of entering students to faculty in a variety of disciplines. (Many said they were planning to take a second semester course with one of the participating faculty.) (4) a more critical sense of how one best learns. A greater awareness that authority, per se, may limit rather than encourage intellectual growth. A realization of the questions they didn't ask.

A second appraisal of FHS was done through a questionnaire that was administered to the participants by an educational psychologist.[1] Among the three strongest points of FHS that were noted by students was the opportunity to know the faculty members well, to come to know them as persons. Seventy-nine percent of the students found the faculty helpful in learning to analyze, evaluate, and report on complex textual material. Too, no less than 85 percent of the students thought that the faculty worked together well in the program while 15 percent were unsure.

All students but one approved of having the faculty for the program present original lectures, chiefly because the faculty presented themselves as models of what and how to think in a critical manner. Student critiques of the lectures were considered of value by 77 percent of the students because, in the main, they learned how varied their views were on critical issues and how widely their interpretations of events varied. The critiques were viewed primarily as another means for learning to think in a specific way rather than a means for evaluating the faculty members.

In sum, the results for the first offering of the FHS, as far as instructional modes were concerned, were very positive. Students were asked to give a critique on everything regarding the project, courses, faculty, and facilities. All but one student considered the experience so valuable that it should be continued for freshmen in 1976. They valued greatly the freedom to discuss their views, the opportunity to know and interact with faculty, and the small class size. Seventy-seven percent reported that they would enroll in all of the courses again. Some findings related to faculty performance are:

	Percent
Faculty helpful in developing skills in reasoning and analysis	79
Faculty worked well with each other	85

[1] Professor William Hauck, Department of Education

	Percent
Reading material good	82
Work load reasonable	95
Original lectures valuable	95
Student critiques endorsed	77

Faculty members found that their involvement in the courses grew when the student's involvement was greater than expected. Both students and faculty attribute their heavy involvement to (a) the contrast between expectations and what was actually experienced and (b) the use of simulation as one of the methods of teaching, a method in which participation is required.

A third source of information on the FHS was a study of the perceptions of freshmen (1975-76 and 1976-77) of their experience at Bucknell.[1] All replies to the survey were anonymous, since students were not asked to identify themselves, but by asking for a report of the courses in which they were enrolled, it was possible to identify the groups who had participated in special programs such as the FHS and to compare the responses of those who were enrolled in special programs with each other, and with those who were enrolled only in the regular courses.

Approximately one-half of the freshmen who were enrolled in the FHS in 1975-76 responded to the survey. All students were asked to cite "specific experiences during the year that particularly contributed to your academic and personal growth" and to tell why it was important to her or him. What is the nature of the <u>critical incidents</u> of the freshman year? Does teaching assume the prominence a faculty would wish? Are there serious differences among sub-populations of the student body? Eighty percent of those students in FHS who responded to the question cited their experience with FHS as of critical importance. They credit it with,

> learning that there is more in the mind
> than what others schedule it to think about
>
> discovering that there is more to education
> than what is learned in the classroom

---

[1]The study was conducted by Professor David Milne and the author with the assistance of Kathleen Kennedy and Alex G. H. Smith. The questionnaire, a description of the methods used, the characteristics of the samples that were obtained for 1976 and 1977, and the nature of the data analysis are provided in Appendix E. A separate report on the full study will be available for distribution in December, 1977.

learning how to develop a critique on rather difficult readings. "I was amazed that I finally achieved success."

helping one to adjust to the differences between high school and college life

establishing a basis for questioning that carries over into other courses.

A comparable sample of students who also were enrolled in a liberal arts curriculum but who had a semester-long "Freshman Advisor Seminar" (FAS)[1] produced strikingly different results. Only 10 percent of this group made any reference to an FAS, and only 40 percent of them provided incidents in which faculty members and courses were mentioned. This outcome is supportive of the position that there is a significant interaction between what is taught and how it is taught. (The analyses of the data for 1977 have not been completed; thus, whether the result will be sustained through the second year of FHS is unknown.)

The halo effect of a program or an activity that has gone well is known to generalize widely. Perhaps, the FHS sample found nearly all of its experience with faculty to be positive. One check on this is to compare the responses of this group and the same FAS sample on academic advising. If the FASs are meeting one of their goals, the comments on faculty advising from this group should be quite positive, and they were, in the main, relative to those for the FHS sample. Specifically, the FAS group found advisors to be concerned and to be helpful with some, if not all questions.

So one student writes,

---

[1]The instructor is the academic adviser for a year or more for the 10-15 students enrolled in the course. The Bucknell University Catalogue described the FASs:

Freshman adviser seminars have been established for the purpose of assisting students to realize the objectives of the distributional program. . . In most cases, the instructor serves as faculty adviser to the students in the seminar during the freshman and sophomore years.

The freshman adviser seminars vary in content, mode of study, and method of instruction. . . They introduce the student to presuppositions, methods, and essential content of an academic discipline or field of study. . . The seminars provide a basis for student-faculty relationship upon which academic advising can be effectively developed.

> I was very lucky--mine really cared about his students.

And another,

> my adviser was very helpful in guiding my choices for courses and future plans.

The FHS sample did not report that its relatively large faculty, whom it came to know "personally," was a substitute for academic advisers. Further, the comments regarding advising were more negative than positive and, thus, they were closer to the views of academic advising that are held by students at large, a topic that will receive further consideration in another section of the report.

Formal evaluation has not yet been undertaken for the other three curricular projects described on pages 19 and 20, in part, for want of time (Mathematics), and, in part, because formal evaluation would be premature at this time. The program of distinguished visiting mathematicians seems to have affected the Department of Mathematics in several ways since its inception. Standards for scholarship have been raised, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Recruitment and recent appointments reflect the elevation of aspirations of the department. Faculty members of the department are writing more proposals (both for research and for teaching) and more have been funded. Department members, students, and external evaluators will review and assess the effectiveness of the program during 1977-78.

Students and Improvement in Teaching

In a recent study, 3500 undergraduates enrolled in 16 colleges and universities were asked what kinds of improvements they believed would make a difference in the quality of teaching.[1] Twenty areas for improvement were listed and the students were asked to rate each item on a five-point scale in terms of its value for improved teaching. The first six items in order of preference with the percent ranking it important were:

Item	Percent
stimulate interest of students in subject	71

[1]Robert Barry and Paul Redditt "Student Attitudes Toward Teaching Improvement," Newsletter, Project on Institutional Renewal, June, 1977; see also, Barry R. Morstain and Jerry G. Gaff, "Student Views of Teaching Improvements," Educational Record, 1977, 58, 3, 299-308.

Item	Percent
more enthusiasm conveyed by teachers for courses	63
encourage more vigorous class discussions	61
relate subject matter more to student interests	60
improve the quality of advising	60
increase opportunities for non-classroom learning	59

The bottom six items with the percent ranking it important were:

Item	Percent
students assume more responsibility for learning	45
place more emphasis on teaching at institutions	42
increase use of media and technology	40
reduce size of classes	39
individual instruction for self-paced study	37
increase faculty knowledge of their subjects	36

The goals of most programs for the improvement of faculties are included among these twenty areas.[1] One can only be struck by the significant discrepancy in values between those who formulate the goals of programs for professional development and students. The authors note that,

---

[1]The remaining eight items in descending order of preference were: clarify course objectives, increase student access to faculty, set and maintain high standards, increase student participation in setting course goals, improve fairness in testing and grading, increase faculty interest in teaching, increase student evaluation of teaching, and treat students more as adults.

> What students seemed to be saying in this survey was that the need for "revitalization" can occur through a variety of means. . . (p. 2)
>
> It is noteworthy that faculty development programs seldom have revitalization of the learning experience. . . as an explicit goal. (p. 2)
>
> . . . creating or maintaining vitality . . . would seem to indicate the need for greater use of a variety of instructional modes. . . (p. 3)

Some of the findings from the Bucknell Freshman Year Survey (Appendix E) are supportive of the outcomes of the study by Barry and Redditt. For example, the Freshman Humanities Semester was intended as an experiment in revitalizing instruction in the humanities for freshmen, while the Freshman Adviser Seminars were directed toward complex ends, one of which was the improvement of academic advising. The results of the survey presented above suggest that the FHS is more successful than the FASs.

Academic Advising

Perhaps there is no relationship with faculty members that truly disappoints students more, year after year, than that of adviser-advisee. It is not at all surprising to find a concern for the quality of faculty advising listed in the Barry and Redditt Study in the first 25 percent of areas worthy of improvement. These authors note,

> Faculty members for the most part have not been trained to handle the more important advising roles. . . faculty are seldom rewarded for effective performance in advising. . . few faculty seem to consider advising a major part of their instructional responsibilities. . . (p. 3; italics added)

Bucknell has increased its resources for advising in recent years, both at the administrative level and the faculty level. Special programs such as FAS, an all-University Committee on Advising and Counseling with student representatives, and printed guides and guidelines for choices have been initiated. Have these changes made any important changes in students'

views of advising at Bucknell? Alas, it would seem not. Freshmen were asked for their judgments regarding advising by faculty advisors, by instructors, residence hall and student life staffs, and administrators. When freshmen like an adviser, he or she is described in such terms as "helpful," "available," "understanding," "interested," and "knowledgeable." When they are dissatisfied with their academic adviser, the description includes these phrases, "too busy," "not in the field of my major," "not acquainted with other courses than his department's," "not interested in me," "gives orders, but does not advise," "not personal enough." Far more advisers are found in the latter set than in the positive set.

The students' instructors fair much better as advisers; the majority are viewed as "very helpful," "very interested in me," "more than willing to assist," "very encouraging," and "always ready to talk about any problem." When the views of instructors as advisers are negative, they take the familiar forms of "too busy," "does not care," or "is not interested in students."

Providing opportunities for faculty members to learn more about advising and building a clearer, closer link between advising and the rewards for achievement would seem to be a necessary and desirable step. Bucknell's juniors, who responded to the 1977 survey, find faculty advising an important area for improvement, too. They place much less value on the advising roles of administrators and residence hall staffs than do freshmen, and they tend to be less dependent upon their faculty adviser, since they have learned to "shop around" for solutions to problems. Nonetheless, they are equally critical as the freshmen.

The Recognition of Teaching

The general posture that has been assumed in this report is a concern for organizational factors in the improvement of teaching. Thus, consideration has been given to seminars and workshops for faculty with a strong emphasis on curriculum development. In these groups, the faculty's perceptions of their disciplines as well as the disciplines of others have been challenged in the belief that changing perceptions of a subject may change the substance of what is taught and how it is taught. Curricula projects in which a concern for teaching is embedded have been presented. And, the workings of the process by which instructional departments reach decisions regarding retention and salary increments have been described in detail. These events and activities are not novel; one suspects that they go on to a degree on nearly all campuses in the United States. The difference between the work described here and that of many other institutions probably rides on the qualifying phrase, "to a degree." The degree, of course, refers to the extent of the faculty's involvement in these activities and the extent to which a collegial model of governance guided the projects. W. Todd Furniss refers to this mode of governance as a parental model of employment.[1]

> The model requires not only skill, knowledge, and autonomy, but also self-regulation and adherence to the seven classic virtues. . . The . . . job is not defined by either time or output.

The matter of "outputs" seems to be one that challenges and baffles the best of the academy, whether planners, teachers, or evaluators. What are the meaningful things to count in assessing teaching, the measures to be taken, the activities to be described?

Rating scales of teaching, i.e., standard forms for student evaluation of teaching and of courses were not a central part of the Bucknell projects that are reported here although faculty members use such rating devices regularly and the results from them become a part of the record that is presented for retention and for merit salary increments. Because of the focus on organization and a definition of teaching that is broader than classroom activities alone, something more than the student evaluation devices was desired. In a broad sense, we want to know how an institution that is an organization for teaching and learning is doing. Hence, we surveyed the freshman class on two

---

[1] "Whatever happened to Faith, Hope and Charity? The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 8, 1977.

successive years, 1976 and 1977, and a junior class in 1977. From these surveys and other sources, we also wish to learn more of how the faculty is doing in its own eyes and in the eyes of students -- students now, and students in earlier times, i.e., alumni. Paulo Freire, in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, argues that education is "suffering from narration sickness." He writes,

> A careful analysis of the teacher-student relationship. . . reveals its. . . narrative character. This relationship involves a narrating subject (the teacher) and patient, listening objects (the students). The contents. . . tends in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified.

Do our students and alumni see us in this light? What are the activities and qualities which they value in teachers? Sadly enough, they often are not able to tell us that. They can name the teachers who appeal, impress, and influence them, sometimes with a high degree of agreement among themselves and sometimes not. We shall be concerned in this section (a) with students' comments on teaching in response to a request for "critical incidents" in their lives on campus, (b) with evaluation of awards for teaching, (c) with alumni, peer, and student nominations of persons whose teaching is outstanding, and (d) with students' attitudes toward their major departments. The relationships among these will, of course, be of greatest interest, if any can be found.

Organizational effectiveness

First something on the effectiveness of organizations in higher education. Cameron reports that there have been no studies of institutions of higher education where organizational effectiveness has been assessed systematically.[1] He devised an instrument for studying nine dimensions of effectiveness of organizations. The instrument was used to assess the effectiveness of organization in 41 Northeast institutions, including Bucknell. Among the nine dimensions are these five:

Bucknell Rank	Scale
(5)	1. Faculty and Administrator Employment Satisfaction
(9)	2. Professional Development and Quality of the Faculty
(9)	3. Student Academic Development
(9)	4. Student Personal Development

[1] Kim Cameron Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education: Feedback Report, August, 1977, Yale University, School of Organization and Management.

Bucknell Rank	Scale
(5)	5. Student Educational Satisfaction

The respondents for the study were faculty and administrators in equal numbers and the faculty members all were departmental chairpersons. The scale responses, then, represent the perceptions and judgments which department heads and administrators have of the effectiveness of their undergraduate college(s) and its activities. Bucknell's rank among the 41 institutions for each of the five scales is given in the parentheses. These few results are presented here as a source of evidence for an organizational climate for teaching, learning, and professional growth. Bucknell fell in the first quartile for each of these activities. There is no way to determine, of course, to what degree, if any, the activities that are included in this report contributed to these ratings.

The "critical incidents"

Each freshman and junior in the survey (Appendix E) were asked to report, "specific experiences during the year that. . . particularly contributed to your academic/personal growth." Students were told that they could include activities or experiences that occurred inside or outside the classroom. The incidents were coded: general growth of the person (e.g., independence, friendships, religion, self-discipline, and interpersonal skills); fraternities and sororities; relations with staff (e.g., faculty, advisor, counselors, and administration); special freshman programs (e.g., freshman camp, freshman dinner, band camp, freshman formal, and the Freshman Humanities Semester); and, facilities and general programs (e.g., volunteer work, cross-generational project, and crafts and arts room).

The critical incidents data are presented in summary form in Table 3.[1] It is possible to conclude that freshmen are more sensitive to changes in their personal growth than are juniors or that personal growth is more important to students in their first year of college than in later years. It is possible, too, that freshmen are treated differently than juniors; still, given the effort which the faculty at Bucknell has devoted to courses for freshmen, the difference is most likely to be related to the expectations of freshmen and the changes that occur in them by the end of the junior year. In any case, if the difference between "personal" and "faculty/courses" holds reliably, there are implications both for what is taught and how it is taught.[2]

---

[1] Professor J. E. Keen, Department of Psychology prepared Table 3 and offered an interpretation of the findings.

[2] The extensive analyses which Professor Douglas Heath has made of the lasting effects of a Haverford education would support this conclusion.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF CRITICAL EXPERIENCES REPORTED BY CATEGORY

	Personal	Social	Fac. staff	Fresh. act.	Vol. Programs	Faculty courses	Extra-curricular
Freshmen	138	26	18	26	68	46	59
Juniors	59	27	15		83	152	55

or, differently

	Personal	Faculty and courses
Freshmen	138	46
Juniors	59	152

In his analysis of these data, Professor Keen compiled an index of "faculty whollop" consisting of all of the incidents of "faculty/courses" and one-half each of "personal," "faculty/staff," and "volunteer/programs." This index then was compared with the total number of critical experiences, with this outcome:

	"Whollop of Faculty"	Other Incidents	Total
Freshmen (75-76)	170	251	421
Freshmen (76-77)	158	223	381
Juniors (76-77)	231	160	391
Total Experiences	559	634	1193

The faculty's influence on freshmen as measured by the number of incidents in which they or their courses figure as "critical" is rather less than they would expect. The faculty's effects on juniors is somewhat stronger.

These data serve to remind one that the gulf between the personal and the academic remains large, larger, perhaps, than need be were teachers more skillful in managing the human relationship that is involved. We learn again, that many experiences at college are critical in their influence; it might be that a faculty and its curricula ought not to become any more important to their students were it to be at the expense of these other influential activities.

Why should the faculty have more of a "whollop" for juniors than for freshmen? Are teachers more influential as students grow older and more skillful as learners? Or, is it that the unique qualities of the freshman year, such as independence from home and the prominence of large peer (reference) groups on a residential campus, dissipate significantly by the end of the third year, thus bringing the activities of the faculty more to the center? We do not have data that cast much light on these questions. Freshmen report more incidents in which faculty members do things that they view as critical while juniors report more incidents in which their own work on projects and papers is critical. Again, one must consider that the shift from the freshman to the junior year may be as much in how students are taught in these respective years as in their perceptions.

Bucknell's calendar is a 4-1-4 plan, where the January term is voluntary and non-credit. Freshmen do not enroll in projects as frequently as do upperclass students and of the freshmen who do not participate no less than one-half of them report that they "relaxed at home" during January. Upperclass students who do not participate more often "relax at Bucknell." Participating freshmen more often select projects in which they can

acquire basic skills (e.g., computer programming or speed reading) or explore a career option than they do performing arts, travel, or research. Upperclass students select the exploration of career options, too, but they also engage in research more, travel more, initiate their own projects more, and engage in the performing arts more. Again, the faculty's roles in the activities selected by freshmen tend to be those of narration and teacher-centered while the roles of those in projects selected most frequently by upperclass students tend to be mentor and catalyst and student-centered. Something of one of these contrasting styles of teaching is found in this observation by Freire[1] in Pedagogy of the Oppressed,

> (The teacher) expounds on a topic completely alien to the existential experience of students. His task is to fill the students with the contents of his narration--contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance. . .

Teaching awards

Bucknell, like many universities and colleges, has given special awards for good teaching for many years, nearly twenty years for one award, the Class of 1956 Lectureship, and fifteen years for the second, Lindback Awards. The awards are made by the President in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, four student class presidents, and two faculty officers. No votes are taken and no commitment is made to the consultants to use only their nominees. There are two Lindback awards and one Class of '56 Award each year.

How do these awardees fare on the ratings that are assigned by the College Dean and Department Head each year? There were 31 faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences who had received a teaching award and who were rated in 1976 and in 1977. Only 5 of the 31 ranked below a 2^+ in 1976 and only 2 ranked below a 2^+ in 1977. (For the faculty of the College, at large, more than fifty percent ranked below 2^+ in 1976 and in 1977.) Since the ratings are a composite of teaching, scholarship, and service, one can conclude that there is a remarkable degree of agreement on the campus regarding the quality of these teachers who have received awards for their teaching.

Satisfaction with majors and faculty

Attitudes toward majors and toward the faculty were obtained from the graduating classes of 1972, 1973, 1974.[1] Satisfaction

---

[1]This study was conducted by Dr. David Wilder and Arlyne Hoyt, Bucknell University Counseling Service. The scales are derived from the College Student Questionnaire, Part II.

with faculty is defined as

> . . . a general attitude of esteem for instructors and the characteristic manner of student-faculty relationships . . ..

A composite score of satisfaction was obtained by averaging the two T-scores for the scales. The meanings of scores are not at all obvious, thus, interpretations of them must be considered hazardous according to Wilder & Hoyt. For example, the "popularity" of a department should be interpreted in the context of work loads expected of students, student/faculty ratio, severity of grading, and restrictions placed on the major.

How will the top-rated faculty be distributed by these scales? All of the members of the College of Arts and Sciences

A. A & S; Faculty ('76)

Departments	Rating of 1	Rating of 2⁻
Top 6	8/33; 24%	9/33; 27%
Bottom 6	11/39; 28%	7/39; 18%

B. A & S; Major ('76)

Departments	Rating of 1	Rating of 2⁻
Top 6	13/51; 25%	5/51; 10%
Bottom 6	6/45; 13%	4/45; 8%

C. A & S; Composite ('76)

Departments	Rating of 1	Rating of 2⁻
Top 6	13/56; 23%	10/56; 18%
Bottom 6	8/40; 20%	7/40; 18%

who had annual ratings of I and all of those who had ratings of II⁻ or lower (on a scale of I-IV) were identified. Then, those whose departments were in the 6 top-ranked and the 6 bottom-ranked in Satisfaction with Faculty were classified as shown in A. above.[1] The top 6 departments had a total of 33 faculty, of whom 8 or 24% received ratings of I. The bottom 6 departments

[1]There are 19 departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, thus, the middle 7 have been excluded from each of these analyses.

had a total of 39 faculty of whom 11 or 28% received ratings of I. From the data available, it may be concluded that the top departments' faculty members received no higher proportion of I's than was received by the bottom departments. (Statistical tests have not been applied to these data, however, it is doubtful that there is a significant difference between the top and bottom departments in the proportion of low ratings.)

Satisfaction with Major is presented in a similar manner in B. In this case, ratings of I are approximately twice as frequent for the top 6 as for the bottom 6 departments. Ratings of II⁻ or lower are equally common for the two groups. The Satisfaction with Major scale may be more closely related to independent judgments of the quality of teaching than is the Satisfaction with Faculty Scale. The Composite Scale (C.) reveals little that is not already evident from the original scales.

Now, let us look at the distribution of Class of '56 awardees among the same groups.

A. A & S; Faculty

Top 6 departments: 55% of the awardees are members of these departments.
Bottom 6 departments: 20% of the awardees are members of these departments.
(NOTE: 3/4th of these awardees are in the same department)

B. A & S; Major

Top 6 departments: 45% of the awardees are members of these departments.
Bottom 6 departments: 15% of the awardees are members of these departments.

C. A & S; Composite

Top 6 departments: 50% of the awardees are members of these departments.
Bottom 6 departments: 10% of the awardees are members of these departments.

We can conclude that these outstanding teachers are found rarely in the departments which students rank low in satisfaction with major or with faculty.

Will the same finding be applicable to the larger group of Lindback awardees?

A. A & S; Faculty

Top 6 departments -- 33% (17 of 52) of the awardees are members of this group.
Bottom 6 departments -- 19% (10 of 52 of the awardees are members of this group.
(NOTE: 6 of the 10 are members of a single department!)

B. A & S; Major

Top 6 departments -- 37% of the awardees are members of this group.
Bottom 6 departments -- 15% of the awardees are members of this group.

C. A & S; Composite

Top 6 departments -- 38% of the awardees are members of this group.
Bottom 6 departments -- 15% of the awardees are members of this group.

We conclude that the Lindback awardees seemingly are a more heterogenous group. They are not very likely to be found in the "bottom 6 departments" but they are as likely to be found in the "middle seven" as they are in the "top six" whether the scale is Faculty, Major, or Composite.

Alumni nominations

All alumni of Bucknell University for whom an address was on file were sent a two-page questionnaire in the Spring, 1977 for the purpose of revising an alumni directory. There were approximately 22,000 surveys mailed of which more than 14,000 had been returned by July, 1977. A sample of 3,000 of the questionnaires was drawn and their responses to the item, "Who influenced you the most during your years at Bucknell?" were tabulated. One or more names were given by 2230 respondents or 74 percent of the sample. This information plus data on sex, age, major, degree obtained, occupation, and more has been loaded onto computer disc for extensive analysis later this year. Some of the more obvious findings will be summarized here.

The 2230 respondents named 412 persons, not all of whom were faculty members. Of the 412, 49 persons were named by 10

or more alumni; 41 of these were faculty members, one of whom was a member of the engineering faculty and three of whom were women.

There were no less than four presidents among the eight administrators named and two of them were of an era when presidents were expected to give teaching a prominent place among their activities. One academic dean (who also taught regularly), a dean of women, a coordinator of student activities, and a physical education director, rounded out the nominees in this group.

The forty members of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences were distributed among 15 departments with no less than 50 percent of them falling into only four departments. One of the four was a Top 6 department (and that for Satisfaction with Major), and one was a Bottom 6 department (and that for Satisfaction with Faculty).[1] Twelve departments of the College of Arts and Sciences that existed for a decade or more after 1940 did not have a member on the list of those of 10 or more nominations.[2] Fifty-eight percent of the humanities, 60 percent of the sciences, and 83 percent of the social science departments were represented on the list.

So much for the background on the alumni count. How do faculty members of the College of Arts and Sciences who have received teaching awards fare in this source of indirect evidence on faculty member's 'worth' to alumni? For the period 1957-1973,[3] 17 persons in Arts and Sciences were named to the Class of '56 Lectureship and for the period 1961-1973, 15 Lindbacks were awarded in A & S. The number of alumni nominations received for them were:

No. of "Votes"	'56 Lecture Awardees	Lindback Awardees
0-9	3	7
10-19	6	2
20-29	5	3
30-39	0	1
40+	3	2
	17	15

[1] No corrections have been made for the relative size of the faculty of each department, the number of majors which each has produced, the proportions of majors represented in the sample, and so on.

[2] Eighty-three percent of the sample graduated since 1939.

[3] 1973 was used as a cutoff because too few classes have graduated to provide a reasonable base for nominations of more recent faculty appointments who also are awardees.

No awardee received a frequency of 0; it will be noted that three of the Class of '56 group (19%) and seven of the Lindbacks (47%) did not rank among the top 40 nominees.

How many of the top 40 who were still faculty members for at least four years following the initiation of monetary awards (1961), failed to receive an award for teaching? There are six, two of whom have responsibilities for working with two student extracurricula activities, a form of 'teaching' that is likely to be overlooked on most campuses.

To sum to this point, then, the selections for teaching awards agree very nicely with alumni nominations of faculty members who influenced them during their years at Bucknell. On the other hand, there are a few instances where those named most frequently by alumni were not so valued by the campus selection system. It may be instructive to study these "exceptions" carefully along with those "exceptions" who received 5-9 alumni nominations but who have not received (or been considered for) a teaching award.

The top 40 nominations were analyzed, too, for the Satisfaction with Faculty and the Satisfaction with Major, Top 6 and Bottom 6 departments, with the following results:

A. A & S; Faculty

Top 6 departments (33): 9 of the 40 or 23% are/were members of these
Bottom 6 departments (39): 12 of the 40 or 30% are/were members of these

B. A & S; Major

Top 6 departments (51): 11 of the 40 or 28% are/were members of these
Bottom 6 departments (45): 8 of the 40 or 20% are/were members of these

C. A & S; Composite

Top 6 departments (56): 14 of the 40 or 35% are/were members of these
Bottom 6 departments (40): 9 of the 40 or 23% are/were members of these

The numbers in the parentheses are the current numbers of faculty members in these groupings. No striking difference is to be discerned in these analyses. Alumni nominations may well turn

out to be relatively independent of the contemporary ranking of the academic departments on the scales of satisfaction. In any case, the span of time covered by the faculty nominees is four decades while the study of satisfaction was concerned with a recent, narrow band of time.

An independent student evaluation[1]

A student group conducted evaluations of courses in the Fall semester of 1975. More than 90% of the courses offered were evaluated. The instrument employed contained 10 rating scales. In addition, general comments were elicited from all students in the course. The results were published by the students as "The Alternative Course Guide." Questionnaires were returned to the individual professors.

It is not clear what credence or weight may be placed on these evaluations. The form of the evaluations, the scoring and analysis of the quantitative data, and the editing of the comments for publication were the responsibility of students. At least 100 students were responsible for preparing the data for no more than four courses each. Differences among these students may contribute to the variance between courses. Furthermore the proportion of students in each course who responded ranged from 7-77 percent with a mean of 41 percent.

A factor analysis of the ten rating scales for 233 courses for which there were 6 or more replies produced a factor structure which, in several respects, was similar to the now classical study of student evaluations by Isaacson et al (1964). The major verimax factor seems to be what has been characterized as "all around teaching ability" (Doyle, 1975). Rating scales that were highly loaded on this factor include (1) clarity of presentation, (2) organization of professor, (3) value of class time, (4) lectures compliment reading and, (5) effectiveness of evaluation. A second factor might be called amount of student participation. The third factor is primarily defined by the rating scale "heaviness of workload" with some loading for "value of out-of-class time." Two scales had small positive loadings on each of the three factors but are probably best considered unique--"amount of feedback" and "availability of professor."

Further analyses of the evaluation data also bear similarity to previous findings. The factor, all around teaching ability,

---

[1]Professor David Milne, Department of Psychology, carried out the factor analysis reported below.

was not related to such variables as size of course enrollment, proportion of majors, proportion of students for whom course is required, anticipated grades, nor rank or years of teaching of the instructor. Courses stratified according to academic area, (1) humanities, (2) social sciences, (3) natural sciences and, (4) engineering, produced no significant differences ($F=.59, df=3,200, p<.62$) on the primary factor. But when courses were broken down by department, differences approached significance ($F=1.46, df=26,181, p<.08$) accounting for 17 percent of the total variance. The second factor, amount of student participation, was negatively correlated with size of class enrollment ($r=-.40$) lending some construct validity to that factor.

Students have repeated their evaluation for the Spring of 1977. This will provide an opportunity to consider the reliability of the student evaluations. Certainly, we will be interested in any evidence of a relation between the amount of change for individual faculty and their involvement in the various development programs offered during the past two years.

Scores on the factor of "general teaching ability" ranged from a +155 to a -357 (s.d. is 100 points). There were 119 members of the College of Arts and Sciences for whom one or more courses were rated; 29 of them had a score or scores in excess of 100 while 66 had a score or scores of -1 or lower. Twenty-one awardees are included in this group of 119. How do they fare in this evaluation? Of the 29 with scores above 100, no less than 10 of them (34%) were recipients of teaching awards. Only three of the 66 with minus scores were awardees.

How many of the faculty members in the Top 6 departments in Satisfaction with Faculty had scores above 100 and how many had scores of less than 0? Of the 21 faculty members in the Top 6 whose courses were rated, six had scores above 100 (29%), and six had scores of less than 0 (29%). How did the Bottom 6 fare in this case? Of the 37 faculty members in this group, nine (24%) had scores above 100 and 21 (57%) had scores of less than 0.

For Satisfaction with Major the Data are:

Top 6 (31)	16% with scores above 100 29 % with scores of less than 0
Bottom 6 (40)	18% with scores above 100 48% with scores of less than 0.

Tentatively, these data suggest that the Satisfaction with Faculty scale and the Satisfaction with Major scale are related to the factor of "general teaching ability" in a manner that the "Bottom 6 departments" tend to have a higher proportion of

low teaching ability scores than is true for the "Top 6 departments."

One further analysis of the study of the student's evaluation of courses may strengthen the support for the conclusion in the preceding paragraph. If all scores on "general teaching ability" for the faculty members of the "Top 6" whose courses were evaluated and for the faculty members of the "Bottom 6" whose courses were evaluated, will the proportion of negative scores tend to be higher for the "Bottom 6" than for the "Top 6" on both Satisfaction with Faculty and Satisfaction with Major? The answer is "yes."

A. Satisfaction with Faculty

Top 6	Plus scores	71%
	Negative scores	29%
Bottom 6	Plus scores	43%
	Negative scores	57%

B. Satisfaction with Major

Top 6	Plus scores	71%
	Negative scores	29%
Bottom 6	Plus scores	53%
	Negative scores	47%

In this section several kinds and sources of data on the assessment of teaching have been examined, usually rather indirectly and inferentially. All of the analyses suffer from the burdens of contamination by multiple factors, hence, the internal consistency and the face validity of these data are interesting; they challenge us to continue these analyses with the adequate statistical controls that we can bring to bear on them through the computer based statistical programs that we will apply to them this year. A master teacher of an earlier generation had this to say to his students:

> I do not wish to communicate knowledge to you -- you can gather that from a hundred sources -- but to awaken in you a faculty which is probably more dormant than the simple power of acquisition. . . I must, in short, to all intents and purposes, be ignorant before you.
>
> Louis Agassiz

Some Issues of Faculty Governance

> We do not often enough reexamine our basic postulates in light of changes in this environment, and, perhaps more important, we shy away from the big questions about how and why the institutional structure is changing -- and where it is taking us.
>
> Robert A. Gordon

Our sojourn of the past four years has taken us from a philosophy of faculty self-governance and responsibility that is reflected in the Faculty Handbook of 1974 to a time for an assessment and revision of that document. In February, 1977 the University's administration distributed a statement on tenure policy to the faculty under the title of Building the Finest Faculty. . . . After considerable discussion of this rather controversial document, the faculty voted to form a committee to study the University's plans for faculty development and recommend means for "Building the Finest. . ." for consideration by the faculty in the Fall, 1977. The author has had the privilege of working with the "Committee for the Development of the Faculty for four months. At the time of this writing (September, 1977) the Committee will recommend some new steps in faculty development for Bucknell University, a Committee on Staff Planning (hiring, staff planning, structural limitations on tenure, assessment of plans, etc.), a Committee on Faculty Development (assist all new hires, all untenured, and all tenured with professional growth in teaching and scholarship) and an all University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. Parts of these three exist now, but the combination of them under the direction and management of the faculty in a full collegial model would be new. We are greatly interested in the future that these proposals will face when they are transmitted to the University Faculty for discussion in October, 1977.

Recommendations Regarding Teaching[1]

1. Each instructional department should have a statement of its goals for instruction. These should be explicit regarding courses for the major, for service to other disciplines, and contributions to interdisciplinary studies.

---

[1]These recommendations are directed mainly toward those who are teachers of undergraduates in colleges in which teaching is the primary concern of the faculty.

2. Each faculty member's plan for teaching requires coordination with the instructional plan of his department.

3. Curriculum revision and reform tends to be more effective and long-lasting when the discussions and course development include a concern for what is to be taught, by whom, to whom, and toward what ends. This is nowhere more the case than when interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs for underclass students are at issue.

4. Judgments of the effectiveness of teaching whether by colleagues or students must consider the goals which a course or courses are to serve, the audience for the course, and the mode(s) of instruction.

5. The weights to be attached to the activities of teaching as well as those for scholarship and professional service should be reflected accurately in a system of merit evaluation and these need to be disseminated to all faculty members.

6. Tenured as well as non-tenured faculty members should be evaluated for the quality of their teaching periodically.

7. Evaluation procedures are likely to be more effective when developed, adopted, and managed by the faculty.

8. No single instrument, survey device, or source of evidence, for the evaluation of teaching can have sufficient validity to be used by itself.

9. Merit salary increments need to be related to a few, well-defined categories of merit. A greater range of rewards and sanctions -- many of which will not involve direct salary payments -- should be used widely. Colleges are by no means doing or using what is already known to bring attention and satisfaction to good teachers.

10. Faculty self-governance, including regulations and practices related to faculty appointments, retention, and tenure, should be revised as need arises to encourage excellence in teaching and to insure that it is rewarded appropriately.

11. Opportunities need to be found annually to renew a campus-wide commitment to teaching publicly, e.g., through the recognition of outstanding faculty and students at an annual convocation and at Commencement, through faculty lectures and panels on "Alumni Day," "Parents Weekend," through presidential statements in reports to the campus and other constituencies. Teaching deserves at least as much attention as athletics; it can have it, given generous amounts of "academic cheerleading" for those who are the stars, viz., the faculty.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences

RE: Scholarly, critical, and creative activities for 1976-77

Dear Colleagues,

As you know, in order to provide for an orderly accumulation of information on the activities of faculty, only one request for an annual report is made each academic year. This is that one request. Would you please send your report to me, with a copy to the Provost, by September 23, 1977? Some of the items you might wish to include are:

1. scholarly activities associated with teaching, such as the development of new courses and preparation of original materials for instruction (syllabi, video material, films, etc.);

2. advising activities, including number of advisees and special efforts to deal with their needs;

3. professional development, including courses or "short" courses completed, institutes attended, and new research and teaching skills acquired;

4. January projects in which you engaged, noting theme, value to your teaching or scholarship, etc.;

5. articles, books, and other forms of publication, giving title, date, publisher, and a brief resume of each;

6. exhibits, performances, and other activities related to creative work, giving place, date, title, and other identifying data;

7. papers presented before learned societies and other academic meetings, giving title, date, and organization;

8. participation in symposia (or their equivalent) at meetings of professional societies, giving title, date, organization and role ("moderator," "analyst," "respondent," etc.);

9. research and scholarly projects in progress;

10. fellorships, grants, and/or contracts for scholarship, giving sponsor, date, and a brief description of the project (including proposals submitted as well as those funded);

11. professional honors, offices held in professional societies, etc.

I thank you in advance for your response.

Yours,

Robert H. Chambers, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences

Appendix B

Faculty Perceptions of a Merit System

The faculty was polled in April, 1976 by a committee on economic benefits to learn more of the faculty's views of the merit salary practices at Bucknell and of their perceptions of the extent to which annual ratings (on a four point scale) of performance are translated effectively into annual salary increments.

The survey was distributed to the 182 faculty members in tenurable positions; 133 or 73 percent of them responded. The sample is reasonably representative as can be seen in Table I.

The answers for the total sample were tabulated for each of the questions. Responses were tabulated also by rank, tenured or non-tenured, years of service, discipline, and salary. A few of these data will be reported here.

The annual report on salary increments which was issued by the Provost in 1975 and in 1976 was found to be of value in understanding the salary structure by approximately three-quarters of the faculty. Untenured faculty with less than four years service did not find the report helpful.

The faculty was sharply divided in its views regarding the range of salaries for each rank and

for all ranks as it was on the question of the size of the gap between average salaries. The higher salaried persons (where salary level is complexly related to competence, experience, and the discipline) favor a wide salary range while those whose salaries are low (complexly related, too, to experience, competence, and discipline) tend to favor attentuation of the range.

Two-thirds of the sample reported that it was opposed to a lock-step, non-merit salary schedule; those who might favor such a schedule tended to be instructors with salaries below the median and members of one of the disciplines in the humanities.

Complex responses were obtained to the statement. "Annual evaluation reports for all faculty members should be used as the primary method for evaluating faculty performance." A majority of the respondents (56 percent) agreed with the statement. Yet, 100 percent of the instructors disagreed. Those faculty members with 0-7 years of service tended to agree more often than did those with 12 or more years of service. Those in the humanities disagreed more often (40 percent) than did the rest of the sample (30 percent). The highest agreement (77 percent) was

TABLE I

FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RETURNS

	Population	Number in Sample	%
All Respondents	182	133	73%
RANK			
Instructor	8	7	88%
Asst. Professor	60	37	62%
Assoc. Professor	55	43	78%
Professor	59	41	69%
Did not Indicate		5	04%
TENURED - NON-TENURED			
Tenured	81	113	72%
Non-Tenured	50	69	72%
Did not Indicate		2	02%
YEARS OF SERVICE			
0-3 Years	29	29	100%
4-7 Years	43	25	58%
8-11 Years	44	36	82%
12-15 Years	16	11	69%
Over 15 Years	50	31	62%
Did not Indicate		1	01%
SALARY			
$10,000-14,000	56	22	39%
$15,000-19,900	82	61	74%
$20,000-24,900	30	31	103%
$25,000 or more	14	14	100%
Did not Indicate		6	05%
DISCIPLINE			
Engineering	24	14	58%
Humanities	64	51	80%
Natural Sciences	43	26	60%
Social Sciences	51	33	65%
Did not Indicate		9	07%

shown by engineering faculty. Those without tenure, then, favored annual reports as the primary method. Tenured faculty did not agree as often; one might guess that they object to annual reports but not to periodic reports as the primary method. The merit system is supported less often by those in disciplines in which the marketplace for their talents placed them at an economic disadvantage during the 1960s, e.g., many of the humanities such as English and the languages.

Two-thirds of the sample believe that sabbatical leaves, travel funds, and summer research grants are valid means for "rewarding good faculty performance." Those with little experience and those with more than 15 years of service were in stronger agreement with the statement than those in the 12-15 year group. This last group is at a stage in their careers where leaves and grants are less frequent than they wish; thus, their responses reflect their frustration with a system that cannot reward all deserving persons.

Finally, annual salary increments were favored for rewarding good performance (56 percent). Whether the merit principle in setting increments for individuals provides strong motivation produced an equal

division of opinion; however, when the data are examined by discipline, the humanities turn out to disagree much more often (63 percent) than the others; the majority of respondents in all disciplines except the humanities indicated agreement. Other questions in the survey suggest that the principle of merit pay is one with which a third or so of the faculty disagree when the system used at Bucknell is the standard.

Survey

Dear Colleague:

The Faculty Sub-committee on Economic Status has developed the following questionnaire to generate valid information concerning faculty attitudes toward the merit system and economic conditions in general. It is very important for us to get a representative return if the data is to have any validity.

Will you please take the few minutes necessary to answer this questionnaire and return it as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope by May 21? Please do not include your name. You may be assured that all data will remain confidential.

Thank you for your time and help.

Please check your rank:

Instructor ___ Asst. Professor ___ Assoc. Professor ___ Full Professor ___

Check whether you are tenured or non-tenured:

Tenured ___ Non-tenured ___

Indicate your length of service at Bucknell:

0-3 yrs. ___ 4-7 yrs. ___ 8-12 yrs. ___ 12-15 yrs. ___ Over 15 yrs. ___

Indicate the range of your salary for the academic year 1976-77:

$10,000-$14,900 ___ $15,000-$19,900 ___ $20,000-$24,900 ___ $25,000 or more ___

Check your academic discipline:

Engineering ___; Humanities ___; Natural Sciences ___; Social Sciences ___.

Please indicate in the appropriate space your attitude toward the

following statements according to the following key: SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = no opinion; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree.

1. The Provost's letter of February 19 summarizing salary increments for the 1976-77 school year has helped me in understanding the salary structure. ___

2. The raises awarded for the 1976-77 year are generally just and fair. ___

3. The range of salaries within each rank should be reduced by providing those at the lower end of the scale with proportionally larger raises than those at the upper end. ___

4. The gap between average salaries for each rank is too small (i.e., there should be a greater range). ___

5. A lock-step salary schedule similar to those used in Pennsylvania State Universities (whereby raises are awarded for years of service, not merit) should be used at Bucknell. ___

6. Annual evaluation reports for all faculty members should be used as the primary method for evaluating faculty performance. ___

7. The salary range for each rank should be reduced by applying a fixed percentage of the monies allotted annually for salaries for this purpose. ___

8. Sabbatical leaves, travel funds, summer grants, etc., are valid ways of rewarding good faculty performance. ___

9. Annual salary increments are the best ways of rewarding good faculty performance.

10. Using the merit principle to determine raises provides a strong motivating force for improving my performance. ___

11. Using the merit principle to determine raises provides a strong motivating force for improving the performance of my colleagues. ___

12. Raises based on a percentage of existing salary should be used to determine all non-merit salary increases. ___

13. During periods of high inflation every faculty member should receive at least a modest salary increase. ___

14. Any proportion of salary increase awarded on a non-merit basis should be based on rank, with professors receiving the largest increments, associate professors the second largest, and assistant professors the smallest. ___

15. Any proportion of salary increase awarded on a non-merit basis should be based on rank, assistant professors receiving the largest increments, associate professors the second largest, and professors the smallest. ___

16. Any proportion of salary increase awarded on a non-merit basis should be based on a fixed amount with all ranks receiving the same increase. ___

17. The committee to study the economic status of the faculty is not needed. ___

18. The merit concept of awarding raises had not worked well at Bucknell and should be discontinued. ___

19. According to AAUP criteria, instructors and assistant professors receive average salaries that place them in AAUP's category A (the highest category) while associate and full professors receive average salaries that place them in category B. Adjustments should be made so that associate and full professors will receive salaries that will place them in category A. ___

20. Starting salaries in some departments must be higher than in others to enable the University to compete for qualified people who can demand higher wages "in the marketplace." ___

21. Starting salaries for all new, non-experienced faculty members should be the same. ___

22. If a general policy is established relative to proportions of merit and non-merit increases, it should be made at the department level rather than college or university level. ___

23. Please rank the methods listed below (highest first) as you feel they should be used in determining faculty raises.

1. prior inequities	1. _____
2. merit	2. _____
3. inflation	3. _____
4. fixed increases	4. _____

Appendix C

Example for
Individual Profile

Name: Small, John M. (Carol) Age: 42

Department: Political Science

Rank: Associate Professor

Education: Cornell University B.A.
University of North Carolina Ph.D.
Post-doctoral year in economics, Univ. of Penna.

Experience: Union College 4 years
Bucknell University 10 years

Teaching: American Politics and Government
American Political Parties
American Political Behavior

Major Honors, Fellowships, and Awards:

Phi Beta Kappa
Ford Foundation Grant to develop curriculum in political behavior
Lindback Award for Distinguished Teaching

Major University Service:

University Senate
Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure
departmental committee on graduate program
Advisor, Chess Club (Computer Chess)

Recent Scholarship:

Article on Democratic Primaries for Presidential election of 1976

Co-editor for, and contributed a chapter to, 20th Century American Politics

Book: Politics of the Region (Halle-Brown)

Other:

Computer applications in political science
Statistical applications in pol. sci. and related areas

Example for
Departmental Profile

1976-77

Art

1) Faculty Advisors:

McCarthy	27	students
Pellegrino	12	students
Stein	8	students
Dada	10	students
Eicher	20	students
Post	22	students
Total	99	students

2) University Courses:

first semester			second semester		
Eicher	UC 122	(35 students)	Stein	UC 265	(23 students)

3) Freshmen Advisor Seminars:

first semester			second semester
Pellegrino	FS 068	(14 students)	None
Dada	FS 076	(9 students)	

4) Sabbaticals and Leaves of Absence:

Schwab - full-year

5) January Intersession Program:

McCarthy - 3 projects (18 students)
Pellegrino - 1 project (4 students)
Dada - 1 project (1 student)
Post - 2 projects (6 students)

6) Graduate Assistants:

In 1976-77, the Art Department employed two graduate assistants.

7) Honors Courses:

Eicher

8) Graduate Direction:

first semester	second semester
None	None

9) Independent Studies Projects:

first semester			second semester	
McCarthy	319	(2 students)	Pellegrino	(1 student)
			Post	(3 students)
			McCarthy	(3 students)

10) Overloads:

Typically, one or more faculty members may teach a studies course as an overload.

11) Scholarly Activities:

The faculty of the Art Department published three articles, seven monograph reviews, attended one workshop, received four grants, and held twenty-one exhibitions.

12) Other:

(a) Exhibits and extensive studio facilities for painting, printmaking, and sculpture managed by the faculty.

(b) Supporting facilities, summers, Governor's School for the Arts.

(c) Classroom facilities and offices widely dispersed over the campus.

Footnotes

1976-77

1. Department Head
2. Excludes UC 122 (35 students)
3. Excludes Freshmen Advisor Seminars
4. Excludes UC 265 (23 students)
5. Excludes UC 243 (17 students)
6. Released time - Director of January Program

etc.

August, 1977

Departmental Data
1976-77

Example for Humanities, Social Science

Art

	1st Semester			2nd Semester		
Name	TE	ACL	ME	TE	ACL	ME
McCarthy	106	3	35.3	128	3	42.6
Pellegrino	42	2^3	21	51	3	17
Stein	35	3	11.6	22	2^4	11
Dada	28	2^3	14	36	3	12
Eicher	36	2^2	18	43	3	14.3
Post	69	2^1	34.5	54	2^1	27
	TE	ACL	ME	TE	ACL	ME
Totals	316	14	22.5	334	16	20.8
	FTEF		ME/FTEF	FTEF		ME/FTEF
	4		79	5.3		63

August, 1977

Departmental Data
1976-77

Example for Natural Sciences, Engineering

Geology/Geography

	1st Semester			2nd Semester		
Name	TE	ACL	ME	TE	ACL	ME
Rockford	43	1^{1}	43	54	1^{1}	54
Helms	110	2	55	86	2	43
Miner	78	2	39	67	2	33.5
Scott	62	1^{6}	62	99	1^{6}	99
Orr	36	1^{5}	36	135	2	67.5
	TE	ACL	ME	TE	ACL	ME
Totals	329	7	47	441	8	55.1
	FTEF		ME/FTEF	FTEF		ME/FTEF
	3.5		94	4		110.2

83

84

Definition of Data Terms

1. FTEF - Full time equivalent faculty member.
   Typically, FTEF refers to persons assigned to departmental programs. Example: if a faculty member teaches 2 courses in a department and 1 outside, the ACL (adjusted course load) for the department is 2. The FTEF is arrived at by adding the ACLs of the department and dividing by 2 (the sciences, and some engineering) or 3 (Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences). The dividend is theFTEF per department.

2. TE - Total enrollment.
   Typically, the total enrollment refers to the number of students enrolled in departmental courses. Example: if a faculty member teaches 2 courses in a department totaling 43 students, and 1 outside course with 12 students, the TE per department is arrived at by using the number 43, not 55, because we are focusing on enrollments in programs, not enrollments per individual.

3. ACL - Adjusted course load.
   The adjusted course load refers to the number of courses taught by a faculty member in a particular department. Example: a faculty member who is chairperson of a department and teaches 1 departmental course and 1 outside course has an ACL of 1.
   Note: The ACL differs from program to program. Example: the sciences typically receive an ACL of 2 because of laboratories, while the Social Sciences receive an ACL of 3. Engineering ACLs vary between programs.

4. ME - Mean enrollment.
   The ME is arrived at by dividing total enrollment (in departmental courses) by departmental ACLs.

5. ME/FTEF - Mean Enrollment per full-time equivalent faculty member.
   The ME/FTEF is the total enrollment (in departmental courses) divided by the department's FTEF. Example: a department may employ 6 faculty members, but has a departmental FTEF of 4. The TE, then, is divided by 4, not 6. The dividend is the ME/FTEF.

APPENDIX D

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT BUCKNELL

Programs of faculty professional development are proliferating very rapidly; "faculty development" has become in the words of one observer, Jerry Gaff, "a national pastime in higher education." Individual programs focus on one or more of these areas: (a) development of the faculty member's knowledge of his discipline, his teaching or his scholarship; (b) development of the curriculum, particularly of courses; and (c) development of the context or setting in which the teaching and learning is done. William Toombs[1] refers to these three approaches to development as the professional dimension, the curricular dimension, and the institutional dimension.

It may be of interest to some of our colleagues to learn something of Bucknell's activities in "faculty development" during the past two years. Toombs notes that the academic profession long has been concerned with the autonomy of the individual professor, the academic freedom of members of the profession, and the competence of each professor in a discipline. Most four year institutions and comprehensive universities long have provided some resources for professional development. Reduced teaching loads, technical services, equipment and supplies, secretarial assistance, special facilities, leaves of absence, travel funds, teaching and research assistants, lectures, and in-service training are familiar categories of funds for this dimension of development. Nearly all of these categories are supported to a degree by Bucknell University's budget for instruction. They also are supported by grants and contracts to the University from foundations, corporations, government, and individual donors obtained upon the initiative of faculty members and administrators. Some instances of support for Bucknell faculty may help at this point. Leaves of absence for relearning and retraining within one's discipline have been supported by funds from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation, the Andrew Mellon Foundation, the Engineering Alumni Fund, among others. In other cases, sabbatical leaves supplemented by funds obtained on individual initiative have made it possible for faculty members to devote a semester or more to learning new skills and acquiring new information for teaching or scholarship.

Consultants have conducted workshops on teaching on two occasions in the past year. A similar workshop on teaching and the curriculum was supported by Danforth associates in 1974.

---

[1] "A Three-Dimensional View of Faculty Development." Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46, 701-717.

The strong interest of several members of the faculty in enhancing teaching has made these workshops possible as have monies from the U. S. Office of Education in support of Bucknell's status as one of eleven Associates of National Project III (a project devoted to elevating the importance of teaching). Several faculty members have served as sponsors for workshops; many others have supported them enthusiastically.

Colloquia, faculty seminars, active participation in professional meetings, departmental luncheons, short courses, summer work, January projects, and much unheralded private study occupy a large proportion of Bucknell faculty members as they continue their efforts to contribute to and be at ease in and with their disciplines and the teaching of them.

The curricular dimension may be viewed from the perspective of the teacher and from that of the student. The extent of the faculty's commitment to teaching at Bucknell, as well as at comparable four-year institutions is not perceived as widely as it ought to be, including among faculty members themselves. It is unfortunate, too, that so much anxiety and defensiveness are to be found in conversations with faculty members across the country regarding their teaching. I suspect that in a relative sense few of the faculty members at institutions like Bucknell can be considered inadequate teachers and even fewer can be considered to be unconcerned. There is considerable evidence to suggest that the opposite is true. When two or three dozen persons give up a weekend to discuss teaching, when two dozen commit themselves to an evening a month for a year "in seminar," when lights burn nightly in many faculty offices, when courses are divided into smaller sections by faculty members who want to offer their students more attention, when team teaching occurs as an overload, when honors work and independent study is assumed as an obligation beyond the three-course load, and on through many other examples, one can only conclude that there is concern for the quality of teaching and learning.

Some of the more visible curricular projects of the past two years are the Freshman Humanities Semester (supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities), the Humanities Colloquia and Faculty Seminars (also NEH), the English Department's Symposia (Andrew Mellon), the Distinguished Visiting Fellows Program of the Department of Mathematics (R.K. Mellon), the Principles of Economics course (Bucknell Special Project Fund and McKenna Foundation), the Social Science Departments' ad hoc planning committee, the Humanities Departments' ad hoc planning committee(s), and proposals for core curricula (NEH, in part).
An interesting component of nearly all of these is that of formal

evaluation of the effectiveness of each where the evaluation plan was devised before the course or program was begun and where the evaluation was conducted, in whole or in part, by a person other than those who developed and taught the course. This year, in addition, Professor David Milne has undertaken a study of students' perceptions of their academic experience during their freshman year. This baseline information was collected under National Project III (FIPSE) for use in interpreting some of the other projects. More on this later as the results become available. Of course, the development and revision of courses remains a continuing concern of all faculty members.

The learning side of the curricular dimension surely is of equal importance with the teaching side. It is a topic worthy of its own report, since there are many instances of the faculty's concern with the conditions for effective learning. Some departments regularly devote considerable attention to effective learning. Many efforts at individualizing instruction (Instructional Systems, Keller Plans, Continuous Progress Plans, and competency-based instruction) are to be found in regular use at Bucknell.

Toombs observes that,

> "the academic profession can be practiced only in an institutional setting so there is an interest, a priori, in maintaining the institution.
>
> ". . . the implications for faculty development begin at the level of awareness. This can be raised . . . by presenting to all faculty at regular intervals. . . a set of indicators on the state of the institution . . .
>
> "Basic indicators reflect costs, student flow, and academic conditions. . . Only when there is an awareness of the institution as a whole can a faculty sense the implications of their collective efforts. . . this kind of information . . . in many cases involves no more than substitution of sound information for coffee-hour conversation."

The Committee on Academic Programs and Resources, its subcommittees, and my office have been at work for more than a year on the development of data in forms which might be useful in understanding more about the institution and the consequences of some of our practices. . .

In these pages, several activities that relate directly to the common objective of faculty professional development at Bucknell have been highlighted for the purpose of providing faculty members with a common perspective on the relationship of these activities to maintaining and improving our worth as college teachers.

APPENDIX E

THE FRESHMAN SURVEY

In June, 1976 and in June, 1977, two weeks after the freshmen had completed their final examinations, a questionnaire was sent to each of them to the home address. In 1977, Bucknell juniors received the questionnaire, also.

The Samples

	'79	'80	'78
Size of class	815	833	759
Response (n)	269	320	255
	33%	38%	34%
Male	60%	55%	61%
Male (n)	60%	46%	54%
Female	40%	45%	39%
Female (n)	40%	54%	46%
Bach. Arts	44%	45%	49%
Bach. Arts (n)	43%	40%	41%
Bach. Science	56%	55%	51%
Bach. Science (n)	57%	59%	59%
Mn. Grade Av.			
The Class	2.80	2.78	2.95
The Sample	2.97	2.91	3.25
JAN Plan			
The Class	27%	36%	38%
The Sample	38%	49%	67%

The questionnaires were coded and entered onto a computer disk for on-line access to all of the data on demand.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY *Lewisburg, Pennsylvania*
ZIP CODE 17837

June 4, 1977

Dear Bucknellian:

A questionnaire. Afraid so. But, this is an important one.

Bucknell has developed a number of new programs and still more are anticipated. We need information to evaluate these programs. Further, we must identify needs of students which are not being met.

Won't you please take a moment <u>now</u> to fill out this questionnaire? You are not required to sign this questionnaire, and your anonymity will be protected.

You will be asked to make some estimates of time spent at various activities. It may bother you to make what only can be considered "rough guesses." But rough guesses are all that are needed for our purposes. On the first page of the questionnaire you will be asked to compare the academic and personal growth you made during your freshman semester with the growth made in your "most productive semester" in high school. This may seem a strange and difficult comparison for which you might give long, thoughtful deliberation. Don't! Just give us your rather immediate reaction.

The important thing is that you fill out and return the questionnaire. Otherwise, University policies and programs may be developed on "other" peoples' experiences.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. Have a richly rewarding summer.

Wendell I. Smith

Self-Evaluation of Progress -- (FIRST SEMESTER, FALL, 1976)

You are asked to rate the progress that you feel you made during the full semester at Bucknell on 10 dimensions listed below. The criterion, against which you are asked to compare your progress, is the best semester you had in high school. That is, think of the single semester in high school which was most productive in which you feel you achieved overall the most academic/personal growth. Then, compare your progress during the full semester against that criterion using the ratings as follows:

Rating Scale

1. Less than my best high school semester
2. About the same as my best high school semester
3. A little more than my best high school semester
4. Considerably more than my best high school semester
5. Much more than my best high school semester; in fact, much more than I ever expected.

Dimensions	Please Circle
1. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).	1 2 3 4 5
2. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Learning to apply course material to improve rational thinking, problem-solving and decision making.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course.	1 2 3 4 5
5. Learning how professionals in their field go about the process of gaining new knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5
6. Developing creative capacities.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Developing a sense of personal responsibility (self-reliance, self-discipline).	1 2 3 4 5
8. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual-cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5
9. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing.	1 2 3 4 5
10. Discovering the implications of course material for understanding myself (interests, talents, values, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5

Self-Evaluation of Progress (SECOND SEMESTER, SPRING, 1977)

Now you are requested to make the same ratings for the Spring semester. Use the same criterion, your best high school semester.

Rating Scale

1. Less than my best high school semester
2. About the same as my best high school semester
3. A little more than my best high school semester
4. Considerably more than my best high school semester
5. Much more than my best high school semester; in fact, much more than I ever expected.

Dimensions	Please Circle
1. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).	1 2 3 4 5
2. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Learning to apply course material to improve rational thinking, problem-solving and decision making.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course.	1 2 3 4 5
5. Learning how professionals in their field go about the process of gaining new knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5
6. Developing creative capacities.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Developing a sense of personal responsibility (self-reliance, self-discipline).	1 2 3 4 5
8. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual-cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5
9. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing.	1 2 3 4 5
10. Discovering the implications of course material for understanding myself (interests, talents, values, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5

Critical Experiences

We are interested in specific experiences during the year that you feel particularly contributed to your academic/personal growth. These experiences might include specific achievements, projects, papers and activities both within and outside of the classroom. You are asked to briefly describe one or more experience below.

Try to be as specific as possible when describing (1) the nature of the experience or product and (2) why it was important to you.

1. _____

_____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

_____

3. _____

_____

_____

_____

Course Work

In the spaces provided below, you are asked to supply the following information:

1. The department and number of each course, e.g., PS100, FR104. Section letters are not needed.

2. The grade you received in the course.

3. A rough estimate of the average number of hours you spent on the course per week in the semester. Include in your estimate time in class, labs, trips, and other scheduled events, homework assignments, term papers, projects, research reports, etc. A few courses do not extend over the entire semester. If you have such a course, indicate it, e.g., 10 hrs/8 weeks.

		Course	Grade	Estimated average Amount of time per week
First Semester	1.			
	2.			
	3.			
	4.			
if needed	5.			
Second Semester	1.			
	2.			
	3.			
	4.			
if needed	5.			

Advising

Please provide the following information for advisors with whom you have had direct experience. If you did not have occasion to meet with personnel listed, leave blank and go on to the next one.

1. A rough estimate of the total amount of time during the year spent in an advisory relationship. Estimate the total number of hours spent throughout the year. Use fractions when appropriate.

2. A rating of your satisfaction on a scale from 1 (Very satisfied to 5 (Very dissatisfied).

3. Any comments you might have, favorable or not, regarding your personal experience with the advisory source. We are aware that you might have some observations about advising more generally (e.g., the experiences other students may have had). However, we would appreciate your concentrating on your own personal experience.

1. Faculty Advisor

Total time in advisory sessions _____

Please circle one

1 2 3 4 5

Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

2. Instructor (other than advisor)

Total time in advisory sessions _____

1 2 3 4 5

Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

Was your advisor also an instructor in one of your classes

Yes _____ No _____

3. Academic administrative personnel (e.g., department chairperson, deans and assistant deans)

Total time in advisory sessions _____

1 2 3 4 5

Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

4. Residential personnel (e.g., RA's, RD's, or Residential Life Staff)

Total time in advisory sessions _____ 1 2 3 4 5
Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

5. Student affairs and student program personnel

Total time in advisory sessions _____ 1 2 3 4 5
Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

6. Counseling Center Staff

Total time in advisory sessions _____ 1 2 3 4 5
Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

7. Medical Staff

Total time in advisory sessions _____ 1 2 3 4 5
Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Personal comment _____

_____

8. Religious advisors

Total time in advisory sessions _____ 1 2 3 4 5
Very Satisfied ... Very Dissatisfied

Extra-curricula Activities

For the following types of activities three types of information are requested.

1. Extent of activity. Again "guess-timates" are requested of the amount of time which you spent in the activities. You are asked to give a rough estimate of the number of activity hours in the average week, using fractions as needed.
2. Satisfaction. You are requested to express your satisfaction with the facilities and programs available at Bucknell for the various activities on a 5-point rating scale.
3. Comments. This is completely open-ended. Your reactions, feelings, complaints, satisfactions, etc. are invited.

	Type of Activity	Average no. hrs./week	Very Satisfied				Very Dissatisfied	Comments
1.	Lectures, seminars related to academics	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
2.	Lectures, seminars general interest	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
3.	Sports - varsity	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
4.	Sports - intramural	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
5.	Sports - health and exercise	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
6.	Movies (on campus)	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
7.	Performing arts (e.g., playing in band)	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
8.	Arts and crafts	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
9.	Volunteer work	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
10.	Dramatic performances	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
11.	Musical performances	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
12.	Religious Activities	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
13.	Student Government/ Campus governance	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
14.	Clubs/organizations (not covered above)	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
15.	Other (specify) _____	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
16.	_____	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____
17.	_____	_____	1	2	3	4	5	_____

Extra-Curricula Activities (continued)

Specific Events

The following attempts to specify the events that you found most valuable.

List events in the spaces provided below that you attended and feel particularly found valuable to your growth and development. The event may be unique, e.g., a specific lecture given one night, or reoccurring, e.g., weekly meetings of a club or group. But be as specific as you can. "Movies" is not very informative. More informative is Tuesday night movies sponsored by such-and-such department. Memory, of course, is fallible, one may forget a lecturer's name but remember the topic. That is quite sufficient.

1. _____

_____

2. _____

_____

3. _____

_____

4. _____

_____

5. _____

_____

Biographic Information

1. My high school might be characterized by the following:

Public _____ Urban _____

Private _____ Suburban _____

Rural _____

A rough estimate of the percentage of my senior class who went on to college is _____%.

2. I entered Bucknell in the following curriculum: BA in _____
or
BS in _____

3. At the present time, I am or plan to continue in the same curriculum: Yes _____ No _____

switch to a BA/BS in: _____

right now this decision is (check one): certain _____

probable _____

uncertain _____

4. Male _____

Female _____

5. Age _____

6. Residence at Bucknell

Dorm _____

Off Campus _____

Special House _____

Fraternity _____

Home (i.e., commute) _____

7. Next year I will be:

a sophomore _____

a senior _____

1a. If you participated in a Jan Plan, briefly describe it. _____

_____

1b. Approximately how many hours per week did you spend on your Jan Plan? _____

1c. If you did not participate in a Jan Plan, circle the number below which best describes how you did spend the month.

1. Relaxed at home
2. Relaxed at Bucknell
3. Travel
4. Completed work from first semester
5. Employed
6. Other, specify _____

2. On the following scale from 1-5 how would you rate your satisfaction achievement/activity during the month?

1 2 3 4 5

Very satisfied Very dissatisfied

3. Do you plan to participate in a Jan Plan next year? Yes _____ No _____ Maybe _____

If yes or maybe, in a word or two what type of activity _____

_____.

If you had a job for which you were paid or received compensation during the academic year, please respond to the following. Space is provided for three different jobs. If you were not employed, leave blank.

I worked 1. under a work/study program for (number of hours per week)

2. at Bucknell (other than 1)
3. off campus from (month) to (month)

	Type of job (by number) above	Number of hrs./week	From (month)	to (month)
Job 1	_____	_____	_____	_____
Job 2	_____	_____	_____	_____
Job 3	_____	_____	_____	_____